

THE
PROLEGOMENA
OF
JEAN HARDOUIN

TRANSLATED BY
EDWIN JOHNSON, M.A.

SYDNEY
ANGUS AND ROBERTSON, LTD.
89 CASTLEREAGH STREET
1909
AUSTRALIAN BOOK COMPANY.
21, WARWICK LANE,
LONDON. E.C.

BR
27
.4263
1909

Printed by
Webdale, Shoosmith Ltd., 117 Clarence St., Sydney
for
Angus & Robertson, Ltd., Sydney
London: The Australian Book Company
21 Warwick Lane, E.C.

6/10/15 R. A. I.

PREFACE

"Let truth and error grapple."—*Areopagitica*.

As enquiries have been made for the long-suppressed "Prolegomena" of Father Hardouin—a work on the authorship and authenticity of the works of the "Fathers" and "Doctors" of the Church, and of other ancient writings, which Hardouin two centuries ago characterized as "forgeries" and "atheistic writings" of "an impious crew,"—this translation by the late Edwin Johnson, M.A., Lond., is now published.

Hardouin, in his sweeping assertions (see especially chaps. VII, XII, XIII, and XV), carefully excepted the Sacred or Canonical books; his Church, he argued, was founded upon them and upon Tradition alone:—"Religion stood for thirteen centuries apart from written tradition, safe and inviolate, such as now the Roman Church and, with her, the Catholic World, holds and professes. Christians through 1300 years either wrote no books or only pious books, which were worn out and easily perished, even as the Jews through 1500 years were content with their sacred books alone and tradition. . . . Tradition . . . is the Rule of Faith." (Chap. IX, secs. 24-25.) "The literary craftsmen . . . I repudiate, and how few they were, compared with the multitude of the Faithful! . . . The

v.

284013

Catholic Faith flourished in the Holy Apostolic See, in Bishops, Monks, Clerics, who wrote nothing." (Chap. X, sec. 11.)

Johnson, going farther than Hardouin, after serious study and much hesitation came to the decision that the whole of the so-called "Apostolic" and "Early Christian" writings were of similar and proleptic character; and, in his *Rise of Christendom*, traced Christianity and Judaism to the Mosque.

We, reading the clay tablets of lost civilizations, can now trace many of our religious beliefs, and much of our religious teaching, back through Arabia and Persia to Assyrians, Babylonians, and other earlier dwellers in Mesopotamia. Down through the ages attentive listeners can hear the solemn music, the odes and hymns, the chants and psalms, and, as it comes nearer, the slow and continuous march of the Priestly Orders—the Hebrews one of the later links in a long unbroken chain.

Believers in the Divine evolution and continuity of religious teaching need scarcely be reminded that Religion and Literature are not identical. The imagery and mythology of the "Old" Testament comes down to us through literary channels. What of that literature is historical (in other words, annalistic or genealogical) belonged to more ancient peoples than the Hebrews. The more recent literature of the "Apostles," "Fathers," and "Doctors"—mostly disputations—are but themes and dissertations of rival debating schools of the Renaissance period, when Oriental influence was permeating European thought.

How, then, could the belief have grown up that fugitive writings, circulating under assumed names, were ancient? Hardouin denies their antiquity, and asserts: "Almost immediately after they were conficted, Wyclif and his party abused them; afterwards Luther and Calvin." (Chap. XIII, sec. 19.)

Hardouin also points out the fact that there is "not the slightest vestige of a change in the language during an alleged period of 1500 years." (Chap. VII, sec. 15.)

When one scholar of the Anglican Church (Dr. Hatch) admits that "many institutions and elements of institutions which have sometimes been thought to belong to primitive Christianity belong, in fact, to the Middle Ages"—a second (Dr. Bigg) points out that Augustine's "Confessions" is similar in style to that of the "Imitation of Christ" of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, and a third (Dr. Westcott) that Jerome writes like "a sixteenth-century scholar"—is it not tantamount to saying that it is all of comparatively recent origin? Neither institutions nor language could remain stable for a thousand years—style and language alter materially even in a century with a printing press to stereotype it.

We may dismiss the charge of forgery. There is a simpler and, I think, a satisfactory explanation—error in our chronology. The tale of a chronological system invented by Dionysius Exiguus, six hundred years after the beginning of the Era and eight hundred years before the system came into use, is merely a tale. Our chronological chart was not constructed before

it was required; and some "Little Denis" made it towards the end of the fifteenth century. Elsewhere (Introduction to Johnson's *Rise of English Culture*) I have drawn attention to a few anomalies of the system; so I will only note here that, assuming for the moment the Era of Christ to be correct, the period between the Age of Alexander the Great and our own is roughly 2300 years. We have here, so to speak, a tape measure of twenty-three inches, too long by seven or eight inches; for between the Age of Alexander and our own we have no authentic historical material in Europe for more than fourteen or fifteen centuries. There is a hiatus of more than seven hundred years. When we apply our twenty-three inch tape measure to the histories of Egypt, Persia, and India—wherein the conquests of Alexander also mark a well-known period—we find the same result. It is too long and there are parallel and corresponding gulfs of darkness more than seven hundred years in length, which cannot be bridged by a scrap of authentic historical material. Similar fabulous periods occur in British and Scandinavian history (so-called); Welsh literature goes back only to the "twelfth" century.

Looking backward, we find no authentic Papal records older than the "twelfth" century. That is also the time of the commencement of cathedral-building in Italy, France, and England. On the Continent ecclesiastical buildings succeed the Roman temples without a break. In Rome, the Eternal City, the historians Gregorovius, Freeman, and Bryce see no monuments to mark an intermediate Age between the days of the

Caesars and the later days of her Pontiffs. Mr. Bryce asks "Where is the Rome of the Middle Ages?" a question to which he himself replies, "There is no answer."

There appears to the present writer to be no other satisfactory explanation for the errors of antedating, and charges of forgery, than this of chronological blundering. There was invention of heresies and heresiarchs and Councils and Ecclesiastical history—literary work by "Augustines," "Lactantii," "Tertullians," "Eusebii," "Isidorians," "Procopii"—besides literature of controversy and debate in great abundance. The dating must be attributed to the chronologers who, not much more than four hundred years ago, estimated and approximately fixed the date of "Creation" as only so many generations, or four thousand years, before Christ, and gave us much too liberal an allowance of fifteen hundred years after Christ.

To work out this suggestion: If we assume that "Little Denis" put the clock on 750, or say 753 years, and we deduct that time from our Christian Chronology, we are only in A.D. 1156, which (still upon assumption) corresponds with the year of Rome (A.U.C.) 1909. Adopting this reckoning, the dates of the last 900 or 1000 years would remain as at present, though not as A.D., but as A.U.C.

EDWARD A. PETHERICK.

Melbourne, 30th April, A.U.C., 1909.

INTRODUCTION

JEAN HARDOUIN was born at Quimper in Bretagne, December 23rd, 1646. The son of a printer-bookseller, he may be said to have lived from his cradle to the end of his long life among books. He entered on his novitiate in the Society of Jesus, September 25th, 1660. He taught Belles-Lettres, Rhetoric, and Positive Theology for fifteen years, and afterwards became Librarian at the College de Paris, where he died, September 3rd, 1729.

An exhaustive account of the great scholar's writings will be found in the new edition (1893) of the *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus*, edited by Father C. Sommervogel, pp. 84-111. I propose to give only such particulars as may serve to illustrate Hardouin's opinions on the matter of History.

In the year 1690 the learned public were shocked by a Dissertation from the pen of the distinguished Jesuit, who had long enjoyed high repute as a scholar, in which it was asserted that certain monkish writings under the names of "Facundus Hermianensis, Liberatus, Marius Mercator, Victor of Tunis, Cassiodorus" (the greater part); also some ascribed to "St. Isidore" and "St. Justin Martyr," were not by those authors, but by certain impostors who flourished long afterwards. All these writers belong,

1690

it should be remarked, to that great system of Benedictine writers, that "legion" of impostors, against whom Hardouin continued to wage unrelenting war. In the same Dissertation he attacked a treatise "on the Body and Blood of the Lord," alleged to be from the pen of a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Corbey (Ratramnus or Bertram). Hardouin maintained that this was not a mediæval, but a modern, work, and that in it was to be found *the invention and defence of the Calvinist heresy*.

It is important to note that Hardouin was led by *theological* motives to suspect the writings of the Monks. He had a very keen scent for heresy; and it gradually broke upon him that Writings which were hot-beds of Jansenist, or Lutheran, or Calvinist doctrine, were in fact composed in secret in the monasteries, and published under the disguise of fictitious names of authors, at a very late period.

So again, Hardouin was moved to attack an alleged "Epistle of Chrysostom to a monk Caesarius." In reply, a Professor named Muhlms endeavoured to show, first, that the Epistle was genuine, and secondly, that it *absolutely overthrows the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation*.

1690-3 Hardouin himself relates, in the treatise here translated, how in the years 1690-2-3 he detected the heresies in the writings ascribed to "Augustine" and other monastic writings relied on as those of "Fathers and Doctors" by the Protestant world.

1697 In 1697 were published two works on Chronology by Hardouin. In one of these—that on the Chronology of the Old Testament—he gave to the world, in

brief, what is commonly called his "system" or theory. He had come to the conclusion that all writings which had hitherto passed for "ancient" had been fabricated in the 13th century—with the exception of the works of Cicero, the Natural History of Pliny, the Georgics of Virgil, the Satires and Epistles of Horace, etc. It will be seen that he somewhat vacillated in his opinions on this head; but his fault was not in changing his mind on re-consideration of evidence, but in the rash or over-confident manner in which he stated opinions so extraordinary, without giving his reasons for them.

Hardouin had become an expert in the study of Coins and Medals; and had from this source of information become persuaded that a great mass of the coins were forgeries, and that such as might be considered genuine did not support the credit of the literary histories. His scepticism was deepened the more he studied; and there is no evidence that he ever "looked back."

On the contrary, his mind seems from his mature age to have become set in the frame of historical scepticism, if the phrase be permissible. In a fragment which has been preserved to us he points out that the dates of early Popes and of other Figures in Church literature, such as St. Martin of France, who are important for chronological purposes, have not been ascertained. He shows, with a quiet irony reminding one of Pascal and of Gibbon, that the date of the death of St. Benedict himself, or of his ascension to heaven, cannot be ascertained. With brief effectiveness, he hints that writers who pretend to tell the

truth "as it is in Jesus," or to write of nothing save what they had seen and heard, were flagrant liars. He did not go so far as to say that St. Benedict and St. Martin were merely ideal persons, the creation of monkish artists; but he must have known that this was the case. This fragment may be read in the *Mémoire d'une Société Célèbre* by P. Grosier, of the Society of Jesus.

In consequence, as it appears, of attacks made upon Hardouin's opinions by a scholar named La Croze, Hardouin was led to retract them in 1708. But that he did so only in a formal manner clearly appears from the evidence of his last work, the *Prolegomena*. The *Opera Selecta* were first published at Amsterdam in 1709, and the Jesuits of Paris had discovered and condemned the notorious critic, and obliged him to give a retractation in 1708.

1714-15 In 1714-15 appeared Hardouin's Edition of the Councils, which was printed at the expense of the King, and for which the editor received a pension; but it was almost immediately suppressed on the report of three doctors of the Sorbonne, as containing maxims contrary to the liberties of the Gallican church. Other charges of false editing were brought against him. It is about the edition of the Councils that a well-known story is told. He was asked on one occasion how a writer of his avowed scepticism in reference to all Councils prior to that of Trent could undertake to write the history of them. His reply was, "God and I only know."

1723 In 1723 appeared his edition of Pliny's Natural

History, which gained for him great applause, yet at the same time provoked some controversy by the novel and paradoxical opinions expressed in the Notes.

The *Opera Varia* of Hardouin were published at Amsterdam in 1733, and were placed on the Index in 1733, 1739, 1739.

E. J.

Hampstead,

London, N.W., 1894.

PROLEGOMENA
TO A
CENSURE
OF OLD WRITERS

BY
JEAN HARDOUIN, JESUIT
FROM HIS AUTOGRAPH

LONDON
AT THE EXPENSE OF P. VAILLANT
1766

TO THE READER

(Preface stated to have been written by W. Bowyer)

THE opinion which Jean Hardouin held of the greater part of our alleged Old Writers has long been known from his works. In his edition of Pliny, A.D. 1685, he appears so struck with admiration of that author that nearly all others were held in contempt compared with him, and that presently nothing was to be believed of genuine antiquity unless traces of it could be found in Pliny. This was his test of the good faith, and also of the style and eloquence, of early times. "The impious crew had," he says, "fit craftsmen in every style. But the Latinity in all differs from the Plinian, and other similar old Latin."

He tells us, in this little book, by what degrees this disease of his mind increased: "In the month of August, 1690, I began to scent a fraud in Augustine and his equals; in the month of November I suspected it in all of them; I detected the whole in the month of May, in the year 1692, after I had written down long extracts from particular Greek and Latin writers."

About that time, therefore, as if he had been caught into the third heaven, he cautiously and under a mask brings forward an extraordinary, an incredible informant. "I will adduce," he says, "in this place the

xix.

conjecture of one who is not ever idly given to conjecture, but who is now possibly more suspicious than he should be, and indulges his bent of mind too much. Let each reader take it as he will. The critic I refer to has found out, as he lately whispered in my ear, that a certain band of fellows existed, I know not how many years ago, who had undertaken the task of concocting ancient history, as we now have it, there being at the time none in existence; that he well knew their period and their workshop, and that for their affair they had as aids the works of Tully, Pliny, the Georgics of Virgil, the Satires and Epistles of Horace. These alone, the critic considers—as I fear he will not persuade any other to believe—to be genuine monuments out of the whole of Latin antiquity, besides a very few Inscriptions.”*

Finally, he says that this large crop of fictions sprang up in the 14th century.†

This new dogma was not the suspicious raving of an old man, but the product of a ripe age. Hardouin was not yet fifty; and there were many who strove to prove, by many arguments, that some of the followers of Loyola had nourished this monstrosity. Some years later, Dom. La Croze, of the Order of St. Benedict, publicly bore witness that the Author was held in highest honour by his brethren, who were so secure of his fame and their own that they entrusted to him the task of a new edition of the Councils; that the whole

* See the Latin work, “Chronology restored from old Coins. Pro-
lusion on the coins of the Herodiads, in notes under the year LI.
Permission given, 1692.”

† Prolegomena, p. 12 *et seq.*

Society of Jesus had at heart to depreciate the alleged old monuments, and to render uncertain what had been held certain; that in this design, perhaps, the Jesuit Father Germon had attacked the book of the Benedictine Mabillon *On Diplomatics* (*De Re Diplomatica*), a book received with the highest praise by all, which Father Constant, also a Benedictine, defended. This contest is here renewed by Hardouin.

Such is the brotherly love of the Orders among themselves! Had our countryman Middleton considered these things, he would scarce, I think, have so confidently maintained against Chapman that the opinions of Hardouin were the dreams merely of one aged Jesuit, scoffed at, and justly so, by all.

However that may be, the remonstrances of Dom. La Croze, published in A.D. 1707, led to this result, that in the same year Hardouin retracted the opinions—by the command of his Superiors—which by their permission he had published. But that he concealed, rather than changed his opinions, is abundantly clear and patent from the present work, in which, as before, he teaches that Six only of the old writers have survived in the vast flood of time. “Antiquity preserved only, of the Latins, Plautus, Pliny, the Eclogues of Virgil (nine), with the Georgics, the Satires and Epistles of Horace; of the Greeks, Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey, and nine Books of Herodotus.”*

You perceive, reader, that this little *index expurgatorius* differs somewhat from the former. The number of Latin writers agrees, with the change of one person. In this matter you might deplore the inconstancy and

* Prolegomena, p. 139.

infirmity of our writer, if it were not that trickery and sophistry were apparent, which excite anger rather than demand pardon. Among various new attempts, he, in his love for the name and fame of his Pliny, denied that he was of Verona, because that author often mentioning the years of "our City," means Rome.*

To this La Croze objected the saying of Cicero: "I, by Hercules, think that he and all municipals have two fatherlands, the one of Nature, the other of civity: as the great Cato, though born at Tusculum, became a member of the civity of the Roman people."†

Again: Hardouin denied that the Julian family descended from Venus, and from Aeneas. La Croze replied that C. Julius Caesar is expressly said to be the descendant of Venus in Cicero's Epistle ad Fam. viii. 15. What has Hardouin to say? By what is called a *sextumviral judgment* he puts Cicero out of court, and stealthily puts Plautus in his place, so that he may not be out-voted.§

Although at first he attacks profane writers, his main object seems to be to banish and exile the Fathers and Versions of the Sacred Scriptures, except the Latin Vulgate. No wonder therefore if, in his critical and religious insanity, he never forsook his first design. He proclaims a sacred vow, and proceeds to cast down the old monuments, that he may establish the temple and empire of Rome on the foundation of tradition.

* "Chronology of Old Test." under the year of the City, 608.

† De Legg., book ii., beginning; La Croze, *Vindiciæ*, etc., agst. Hardouin, Rotterdam, 1708, p. 149.

§ "Chronology of O.T." A.D. 14.

Even as in his "Various Works" (Latin) published at Amsterdam, 1733, he made adverse criticism of Virgil's *Æneid* and Horace's *Odes*, so in these *Prolegomena* he declares that he had tested certain of the Ecclesiastical Writers: "Augustine, Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, many Councils, etc."

These *Prolegomena* appear to have been written as part of his critical enterprise, as we learn from the last Addendum. The whole work has perished in the shipwreck of their fortunes, recently suffered by the whole Society of Jesus; or, I know not where in the world it lies hidden. But this fragment, as if snatched from the waters, came into the hands of the bookseller, P. Vaillant, who grudged not to give it to the literary world. For Hardouin's paradoxes delight by their novelty in themselves; and still more so when adorned by his art. So well does he understand how to illuminate obscurities, how to cast what is lucid into the shade, how to give probability to fiction, and to everything a certain beauty and grace, at his will. This fragment, then, such as it is, Vaillant had carefully printed, and consecrated the autograph to posterity, placing it, like a votive tablet, in the British Museum.

These few remarks, which I have made in slight preface, should be taken as referring to a learned colloquy, with which the Rev. Caesar de Missy* favoured me. If I have said anything thoughtlessly, it should be set down to my ignorance; if anything not displeasing, to his credit, who will soon, as I hope, give to the public more information on this matter.

* A Protestant clergyman in London. A Latin reply to Hardouin is extant under his name.

EPITAPH

HARDOUIN, born at Corisopitum (Quimper) in Bretagne, A.D. 1646, died at Paris, September 2nd, 1729. With felicity, M. de Boze has expressed him to the life in this epitaph:—

IN EXPECTATION OF THE JUDGMENT

HERE LIES

THE MOST PARADOXICAL OF MEN,

BY NATURE A FRENCHMAN, BY RELIGION A ROMAN,

THE PORTENT OF THE LITERARY WORLD,

THE WORSHIPPER AND THE DESTROYER OF VENERABLE
ANTIQUITY.

FEVERED WITH LEARNING,

HE WOKE TO PUBLISH DREAMS AND THOUGHTS
UNHEARD OF.

HE WAS PIOUS IN HIS SCEPTICISM,

A CHILD IN CREDULITY, A YOUTH IN RASHNESS, AN OLD
MAN IN MADNESS.

CHAPTER I.

Hardouin attacks the mass of alleged old writers : he defends his conduct in so doing on the ground that they were Atheists. He explains why they have hitherto escaped censure. It was necessary that a Jesuit should undertake the task : because the older Religious Orders have, all of them, forged writings to defend : but especially the Benedictines. He briefly tells how he discovered the frauds in the years 1690-1692.

I Section 1 HERE enter upon a very important, but a very invidious undertaking. It is my intention, with the assistance of God, as long as He grants me life, to show that all writings which are commonly thought to be old, are in fact, with certain exceptions to be presently named, supposititious, and the fabrication of an unprincipled crew of literary men.

The exceptions are, the Books held by the Church to be sacred and canonical, and six Profane Writers, four Latin, two Greek. Meanwhile I do not declare war upon other writers, unless upon the enemies of the Almighty, of Christ, of the supreme Pontiff, and of the Royal authority.

Surely we may be as rigid in our criticism and repudiation of false monuments from which in the slightest degree our holy Religion suffers injury, as are judges in a court when they test and reject documents which are concerned with men's fortunes and estates, if any note of falsity appears in them. Now

if there be but one faulty notation of time in any instrument, a Court will decisively and with great and just indignation reject and repudiate the instrument. How much more vehemently should we vociferate, and how much more justly, when our holy Religion is assailed and undermined!

Section 2 Religion itself and Christian Piety demand that we should deliver them at some lesser risk from a greater peril. The danger is less, if the falsehood of certain facts or allegations which have hitherto obtained credit is acknowledged; but a greater, nay, by far the greatest danger is, if those alleged facts are left unquestioned, and so our faith is gradually injured and overthrown.

Section 3 Let men, if they will, call the opinions I here advance ravings; I care not, so long as I can discredit the doctrines which I denounce as impious and heretical in those writings; I care not, so long as I can warn and teach my readers to abhor them, what men may think of me; I care only to preserve the faith concerning the true God, concerning Christ, concerning every head and chapter of our holy faith, sound and whole.

Section 4 What matters it, I pray you, that no one before my time has said what I have just said, and that I adduce no authority or witness from the ancients in my support? Supposing that I had had a forerunner, would that affect the question of truth? Or because he had long passed away, would that render him worthier of support? I pray you not to believe in men, but in sound arguments.

Section 5 If I had an equal genius to any of those old writers,

if a desire came into my mind to print something under the feigned name of any one of those authors, whose works are believed to have perished; if I were to write it on parchment, with ink specially prepared for the purpose of making the writing appear in the course of a few years some 600 or 800 years old; if I were to transfer into that work certain excerpts from old writers who are commonly supposed to be genuine and sincere, with a view to induce belief in my work and its great age; tell me, would it not be right for any one to try and find out and detect any hidden fraud and impiety that he might suspect? Certainly he would be justified in doing so. And certainly one who is first and foremost a Catholic and a Theologian must be thought at liberty to do the like in reference to all writings which have not yet undergone such censure.

Petavius,* for example, was the first to deny that certain works had been written by Athanasius, which the Benedictines ascribe to his authorship (tom. ii. p. 49, and elsewhere), and he was in the right. And they were also justified who revised the works ascribed to Augustine and Bernard, and who cut them down by one half, which they repudiated. They had the acumen to discern that they were not all of the same style and vein. Tell me, am not I to enjoy the same licence, when I use arguments none the less certain, nay, more convincing? The Apostle says to all, *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.*

It may be asked, How could it be that the ἀθεόρως, *Section 6*

* Petau, the noted Jesuit Chronologer.

the Atheism which I profess to have clearly discovered in these writings, escaped the notice of the Scholastic Theologians of former ages? But I ask in turn how it could come to pass that in this very age, when we have more theologians, and not less gifted, this iniquity escapes them, especially considering how much clearer our books are, owing to the art of Printing? Doubtless in part the cause of this has been that when the Theologians joined hands against the Heretics, they perused only those heads of Doctrine in the alleged monuments of the "Fathers" on which debate had arisen; they did not arrive at the fountain-head of these Dogmata. All were intent upon the object of making the testimonies opposed to them tell in favour of their own respective parties; for example, on the Eucharist, on Penitence, on the efficacy of Grace, and other controverted heads. In this conflict each thought himself successful in proportion to his ingenuity. But if they had weighed the whole literature with the like care, had they put their fingers on the sources, had they perceived that Atheism was taught by these false "Fathers," doubtless they would have recognised the whole fraud; they would have seen that from Atheism nothing sound, nothing but what is most alien from the Catholic Faith, in the Eucharist and other heads, could follow. They would have understood that writings which they had treated with great reverence, because they believed them to have come from the "Fathers," were indeed detestable.

Section 7 It is no wonder that so many impious writings were not in former times suspected of impiety. They lay hid on the shelves of libraries. They were brought

out in a furtive and secret manner, and by degrees. Very few men knew anything of them. But now in our day, when a great number of similarly impious writings are in the hands of all, not only in France, but also in Belgium, Germany, England, and elsewhere, shall no one censure them? Can you wonder at the stupor of former ages—from the fourteenth, in which I think these writings were framed—and not wonder at the stupor of our contemporaries? Can you wonder that the Church has not pronounced upon the matter, seeing that the writings in question have never been brought before the tribunal of the Church? Neither the Church—that is the supreme Pontiff—nor a Council gives judgment upon books, unless there has been a proper judicial interpellation.

I say that before the present time the vast fraud *Section 8* could not be detected. No one could persuade himself or make others believe that all monuments were false and supposititious that had been believed to have been written in some fifteen former ages, unless he had studied them with sedulous attention. The whole system of the impious crew, of which each student took up his own part, could not be understood except by the diligent consideration of each and every part of it. But it is only in our own time that nearly all the writings have been brought forth from the Libraries. There are still some lying hid, but they are few. They are of the same kind with those extant, as will be readily understood by any one who is convinced of the falsity of those in our hands.

The Catholics, then, could not readily recognise the *Section 9* impiety in these writings, nor could the Heretics lay

open what *they* had discovered. Both acknowledge the alleged "Fathers." The Catholics were not at liberty altogether to repudiate them; and they sought to ply and bend them to their own opinions, that their Sons might not be said to depart from the "Fathers." Nor did it occur to the Heretics to cast off writers who supported, as they knew, their own impious hypothesis. Moreover, their object was to show that they were not of recent origin, that they were not the fancies of new doctrines; and they needed the suffrages of these alleged witnesses.

Section 10 Surely Catholic prelates ought to permit me, or any better man, to detect the mystery of iniquity, and bring it into the open light of day. Otherwise they may well fear lest some impious adversary come forward and publish the wicked doctrines in the monuments of the alleged "Fathers," and find support among men, who do not wish to toil as they toiled in getting up Editions, nor to acquire the ill repute connected with evil and impious doctrine, whether it be not understood, or which is worse, championed and defended. Soon, unless God avert the ill, the whole Christian world will become atheist against its will.

Section 11 Assuredly it is all but necessary that a member of the Society of Jesus should detect this wicked craft and malice. For there is scarce another Family of the Priesthood which has not been deceived by some notable book offered to it under the name of some distinguished man in that Family; which book it has forthwith decreed by all means and arts to defend. Thus the Dominicans have "Thomas Aquinas," "Vincent of Beauvais," "Moneta," "Reiner," and

others. The Franciscans have "Bonaventura, Alensis, Scotus." The Carmelites have "Thomas Walden." Other families have other names.

But the Benedictines have a whole legion of them.

Therefore, if at any time the holy Apostolic See *Section 12* would pronounce a judgment on my censure against "Augustine," "Bernard," and "Thomas" (these three writers by the help of God I have despatched; also most of the Councils; I am going to deal with other matters in like manner, while life lasts); I say when that day, greatly desired by me, shall come, let not the Holy See admit to consultation members of any Regular Family, which thinks it has produced from its bosom any of those old writers, and which desires to preserve them at any price. Let the Holy See employ Secular Theologians, or men of incorrupt integrity out of those very Families, who will look after the good of Religion alone. Let them desire to preserve her alone, though all else perish.

The providence of God has hitherto permitted *Section 13* quarrels of Theologians on the opinions of Augustine, Thomas, etc. God cares little about controversies of that kind so long as the faith continues sound and whole, the faith which is necessary for all to salvation. In this faith neither can He suffer the Roman Church, nor has He suffered the Catholic Theologians to err. Meanwhile, not one of those works has been approved by the Apostolic See *ex cathedra*,—that is, after examination instituted and the hearing of advocates on either side on the question of the falsity or sincerity of those works. Enough for the Roman Church her own faith, her own tradition, without the help of

"Augustine" or any other private person whatever. She derives her authority and her magisterial power from none, except Christ and the Holy Spirit promised to her; she should be taught by none, she should teach all, as Mother and Mistress. Nothing so strongly proves the authority of the Roman Church and the providence of God in conserving the true faith through the Holy Apostolic See, as the fact that she has never been corrupted, and will never suffer herself to be corrupted by so many great names of distinguished writers, whether Greek or Latin.

Section 14 Thirty-six years ago, in the year 1693, and afterwards on more than one occasion I declared that the *voθεία* or spuriousness of the "old writers" had become most plain and obvious to me. Then certain Catholics, good and well-meaning men, but of no large views, raised a cry against me. They did not observe that the Calvinists in Holland or Germany vociferated much more loudly. They, forsooth, well knew that if "Augustine" were snatched from them—if he were convicted of atheism—their famous phrase "All Augustine is ours" would bear this sense—"A scoundrel and a foe of the true Deity is all for us." In point of fact, the fellow who assumed and bears the name of "Augustine" teaches absolute atheism under the guise of Christian language.

Section 15 Some one may say, "Are you then wiser than so many men of genius, who read the old writings, and did not observe that they were impious?" I will answer in the words of one of that wicked crew itself, in those forsooth, of Lactantius, book ii, chapter 8:—

"Above all, in a matter that is vital it behoves each

man to consult himself and to rely on his own judgment and proper senses for the purpose of considering and investigating the truth, rather than to be deceived by the errors of others, as if himself devoid of reason. God gave to all a measure of wisdom, that they might investigate unheard-of things, and perpend things heard. Because you have had predecessors in time, it does not follow that they have exceeded you in wisdom, which, if it is given equally to all, cannot be wholly enjoyed by those who went before. To be wise, *i.e.*, to seek the truth, is innate in all; and therefore they cease to be wise who, without any judgment, approve what our ancestors invented, and are led like cattle by others. They are deceived in this, that under the influence of the name of "elders and ancestors," they do not think that they can be wiser, because they are later, or that the others can be foolish, having the name of 'elders.' What hinders that we should take example from themselves; so that even as those who made false inventions handed them down to posterity, so we who find the truth should hand down better things to our posterity?"

To listen to this, nothing assuredly incites us but the desire of seeing the truth, which is contained in the one most holy Catholic Religion.

But, it will be asked, "Why are so many literary *Section 16* monuments attacked, which have been received in good faith by so many ages?" Is there so much good in those errors, or is so much evil feared, if the truth should be laid open, as there is in the fact that Books should be in the hands and before the eyes of all, which have been written by a gang of men, enemies to

Catholic truth—and written with no other design than to remove God entirely from the world, and to overthrow the whole of the doctrines of the Christian faith? These books foster, and will foster, endless and interminable quarrels in the Church, until their nature and quality is recognised. If one should make clearer than the light of noon that the rise and birth of them fell within the last 400 years—that is, in the fourteenth century—would this be a light boon to Christendom? Should it not be preferred to any other gain, if any other there could be?

Section 17 Why did God so long delay the exposure of this fraud? The answer is, He suffered it to be committed that He might one day triumph over it; and He delayed to show it to Catholics, until as I have said, all the books, or at least the greater part, and the most important of the books had been brought out of the Libraries, had been fairly edited and could be conveniently read and understood, and tested by the marginal references. This has come to pass in our own time; hardly before. How helpful are these aids to students, students well know. I judge them to be so important that, before they were afforded, I do not believe the designs of the wicked crew could have been detected.

By the providence of God, meantime, most of the Scholastics neglected the reading of those “Fathers.” The more firmly did they adhere to Tradition alone, and constantly defend it.

Section 18 It was in the month of August, 1690, that I began to scent fraud in Augustine and his contemporaries; in the month of November I suspected the same in all;

and I detected the whole in the month of May, 1692, after I had written down long extracts from particular Greek and Latin writers. In this labour I toiled almost to the point of disgust and weariness, though I had often moments of great delight in the discovery of the truth.

On the question of the good faith of "Cyril, *Section 19* Theodore, Augustine, Jerome," and others, special treatises have been published, and the strife is not yet at an end. If one were to make clear that the authors of such strife emerged from the infernal regions into the world about 400 years ago, to pursue their ill design of publishing their impious writings under the names of Saints and others—ought you not to thank such a man, if he proves the point by perspicuous arguments? For who would undertake the advocacy of impious writings?

CHAPTER II.

The charge of Atheism against the early Ecclesiastical writers repeated: and Hardouin pretends that for the first thirteen centuries Catholic orthodoxy had prevailed, in the absence of literature—He expounds the nature of that orthodoxy, especially in reference to the Trinity, and the Body of Christ. The form of Religion in the alleged Fathers is mere Paganism.

Section 1 I SAY that all these writers were *θεομαχοί*, fighters against God, whose works were circulated until the rise of Printing; and after that invention, a great number in like manner came from the same gang, under false names. God have they none, except the "Nature of things;" others call it mere "Ens," or "Essence," *τὸ ὄν*, or formal Reality, Unity, and Truth of essences, and their Permanence in that unity and truth; the most simple essence, apart from any metaphysical composition. Thence they founded a metaphysical system of religion, dealing with the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharist, and the other Sacraments—of Grace, Justification, and other capital points of religion, as far as men could do so who had no true God.

Section 2 They were the first Heresiarchs in the Christian world, and took their rise in the fourteenth century. They were crafty, and too successful in the propagation of their impiety. How were they to scatter their errors among the vulgar? Were they to adduce Tradi-

tion on their behalf? But for thirteen centuries the worship of the true God, and of Christ had existed among the nations. Were they to allege the writings of men old? None were in existence. They were bound, therefore, to forge writings, not under their own, but under other and great names, and so to pass off their errors upon men of their own and following ages, especially of the studious class. They desired it to be believed that there was no God but Nature; who was the framer of the Universe by necessary and immutable laws of motion, and also the ruler of minds by natural light—the light of Truth, as they call it. They conceived the hope that, owing to the reverence for the Saints, whatever appeared under their names would seem probable to posterity; in particular, this capital principle, which entirely undermines Religion: that God is either τὸ πᾶν, “the All,” or the necessary rectitude of “the All,” according to the rules of Mechanics, Geometry, Prudence, and Truth, so that they might be reckoned Christians who cultivated and preached Truth.

The Christian Religion is the religion of the true *Section 3* God. It ought, therefore, in all its doctrines show the characters of a religion which worships the true God; in other words, it ought to exhibit the idea of the true God in all those dogmata. Still more plainly: All dogmata which the Christian Religion hands down as taught by Christ ought to be such, that you may understand and collect from them that some true God exists. They ought not to be such as they would be if there were no true God at all; if there were but Nature

instead of God, or the natural Light of Reason or of Truth.

For example: We believe Christ to be in the Eucharist, the substance of the Bread being destroyed; thence we understand that the true God is the effector of this miracle; assuredly Nature cannot do this. But the impious Sect to whom I have referred teaches that this transmutation takes place in the mind of believers by pious thought, which they call the "operation of the Holy Spirit." And why? Because these sectarians do not believe there is any God!

And so with all the doctrines of the Christian Religion. There are only two explanations of them. One is the Catholic, which always supposes that there is some true God; the other is the Atheistic, which is contained in written books down to the invention of Printing; and which so expounds the dogmata of our faith, as each of them might be, even if there were no true God. A truly admirable, a truly divine principle, pertinent to all the dogmata of the faith, is this.

The Eucharist, in the written books of which I speak, is simply a *convivium*, a social repast at which men of the same opinions congratulate one another on their fellowship, as signified in the loaf made out of many grains, and on the hope given to them of resurrection like that which befell the Christ. Now they may be believed and carried out, even if there is no true God, but the Resurrection is to occur according to the laws of Nature—or (as they call it) an ἀποκατάστασις or Restitution into the former state of the whole universe or of the sublunary world.

If the Sacraments justify *ex opere operato*, "from

the work operated," if the voice of the priest baptizing or absolving is of this effect; then there must be some true God who has given *such power to men*. But if Repentance and Faith alone justify, and Absolution is simply restitution to the congregation of the faithful and the society of the Saints, whence any had fallen away by sin; then such a discipline as this could be founded by any society whatever apart from God. And so it is in those "old writings," and among the Calvinists, Lutherans, Jansenists,* who were anticipated by those writings. Their religion is wholly external and human, all of such a kind that you cannot understand the true God to be worshipped by them. Catholics alone are *the lot of the Lord, his People, the lot of his inheritance*: Deut. xxxii. 9. The rest know not God; He will say to them, *I know you not!*

In very truth there are in the world only three *Section 4* forms of Religion. The first, and the only true one, is that which worships the true God. The other two are false, and opposed to that true form; one by defect, Atheism (*αθεΐας*) which worships no true God; the other by excess, Polytheism (*πολυθεΐα*) which worships many false gods. To Atheism pertain all the sects, "fighters against God," which I have just reviewed, and which rely upon those "old writings." To Polytheism pertains Idolatry, which is manifold. To true religion Catholics alone pertain; they in the worship of the true God, and much more perfectly, have succeeded to the Jews.

* The Benedictines were commonly suspected of Jansenism by the Jesuits; Giry, *Traité de Diplomatie*, 1894.

Section 5 Vain or slight must be the doubts of any whether of many forms of religion, which acknowledge the worship of the true God, any understands better the word of God, or thinks more rightly of God and of his revelations. For no form of religion acknowledges and worships the true God except the Catholic. To no society but the Catholic, that is, the Church, does God reveal his mysteries. *“Who announces His word to Jacob, His justices and judgments to Israel. He did not the like to any nation, and his judgments he did not manifest to them.”*

Section 6 If there is some true God—and assuredly there is—we must necessarily believe all that the Catholic Religion teaches to have been revealed by God; the Three Persons in God, the Body of Christ on the Altar; or on the other hand, we must say—what is absurd and blasphemous—that God cares naught what that Society believes, which alone under heaven acknowledge and worships Him, and invokes Him with all the heart. For they who now deny these mysteries, the same that follow those “old writers,” deny that He is the true God, whom Catholics acknowledge, revere, love, and fear.

Section 7 *“This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent”*: John xvii. 3. The double or twin knowledge, of God and of Christ, leads to life. Of God as the only true God; that God may not be thought to be either Reality and Truth, whether of essences or of eternal truths, as the false “Augustine” with the “Fathers,” falsely so called, opines, or Essence of Essences, which amounts to the same, and which

Christ foresaw would be substituted by atheists for God; and of Christ, as He only was sent by God as Lawgiver and Redeemer to the human race. The Confession of Peter comprehends both these heads, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*: Matt. xvi. 16. Hence he deserved to hear from Christ: *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*. But if the Church stands upon this double Confession, the Gates of Hell are aptly understood to be the endeavours of Daemons in bringing in Atheism, or in propagating it; by which both of those dogmas of the Christian faith are assailed. Too truly has this been proved by the event.

The form of Religion brought in by that most wicked crew, and by Thomassin first clearly explained and taken up, is mere Gentilism or paganism. "*O God, the Gentiles have come into Thine inheritance, they have polluted Thy holy temple,*"—which is the Catholic Church. In this age you have no need to seek Pagans afar; we live among Pagans; in the very leading city of the most Christian empire there are very many Pagans, who under the habits of Christian priests and religions are truly Bonzes, Brahmans, Druids. If you look at their faith, it has been drawn from writings which bear the names of the "Fathers" on their front. Who, whether Bonze, or Brahman, or Druid, would not subscribe to the extracts from the false "*Augustine,*" which Jansenius and which Ambrosius Victor collected—to the effect that concerning the nature of God inquiry should not go beyond the Truth of all Essences and eternal truths? Tell

B

me—are not they who, like the aforenamed and many others in this age, take great trouble in published books to demonstrate that the existence of God seems—because all things have been aptly and truly formed—to be in accordance with necessary laws of motions and numbers; and that these laws are and should be called God; are they not really pagans and atheists? Do they not cast out the true God from men's minds?

Section 9 The Royal Psalmist, singing "*The Heavens do tell*," etc., and the Wise Man, chap. xiii. 3-5, and Paul, and others in sacred books, prove that God exists from His admirable works; that is, they teach of a Workman distinct from His works, and that by a real distinction, the greatest conceivable—no distinction alone, but real separability. He existed infinite ages before the world that he made; and He can will for ever to annihilate the same. None of those writers, none of those falsely-named "Fathers" proved the existence of God by this argument—that all things hold together by the Truth by which they are formally true; or from this argument, that there is a certain universal Reason, the Light of rational minds. But such was the New Gospel of the false "Fathers."

Section 10 By the great Providence of God it came to pass that they whom the Lord Christ desired to be the first Doctors of the Church were common men, plebeians, men of the lowest vulgar herd. For if he had chosen out Philosophers, or other men of the highest ability, there would now be the greatest temptation in the Church, and occasion of suspicion—whether what ought to be understood by the name of God is not that rather which is expounded in the writings of the false

“Fathers,” and is greedily taken out of them—the Essence of Essences, and τὸ ἐν εἶναι, as the new philosophers and the Jansenists say—rather than what we Catholics worship.

God provided against this evil. First he sent Moses, *Section 11* to teach the true God as the creator of all Nature. Afterwards he sent Christ, who as a greater prophet should teach greater things of God. He taught that the true God could do many things above Nature, much greater things than he did in the creation; that he subsisted in a sublimer manner than he who was known to the Jews. God made nothing in vain. It was necessary that Christ should teach us of the Three Persons in God, that he should make known and require belief in the miracle of the Eucharist. Otherwise, credence would readily be given to the falsely called “Fathers,” and new atheists, that there was no other God than theirs; if there be nothing in the world that does not appear to have been made according to the laws of motion and mechanics—immutable laws which nature follows, as they reason.

But in reply to this it must be said that Atheists cannot fit to their Nature or Essence of Essences, or Laws of Motion, the Ternary number of Persons, who are really distinct from one another, because of the double vital operation of intellect and will. The Miracle in the perpetual and continuous reproduction of the Body of Christ under the species of Bread, the former substance being destroyed, infers that God must be other than the Nature of Things, the Essence of Essences, and Truth or formal Reality of Things. Both these propositions had to be laid before the faith-

ful that they might understand that the deity proposed for worship by the faithful was not the object of worship which they themselves had learned from Moses, and Christ, and the Apostles, and their own ancestors and elders. For Nature and Truth can do nothing but what the human mind can conceive; cannot subsist in any manner beyond our intelligence. That the faith of the true God might be preserved and conserved, it behoved that greater things should be revealed to the Christians concerning Him than to the Jews. Especially God foresaw what has actually happened, that the Rabbis of the Jews would be, many of them, carried away into that Atheism—deceived by the Cabbalistic books, which the same impious crew conficted in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Section 12 Countless books, I might almost say, have been attributed to the "Fathers." The more there are, the greater the wonder that not one of them hinted once, what we believe on the revelation of God, that there is One God in Three Persons, really distinct among one another. Everywhere they talk of the *ὁμοούσιον*, since their truth is consubstantial to Unity or Reality of Essences, of whatever kind that substance may be, that is, metaphorically only. The real distinction of Persons I do not remember to have once read of in writings ascribed to the "Fathers," or others through more than 1300 years from the Birth of Christ! And yet that Real Distinction of Persons ought to have been duly inculcated on Christians; for this faith discriminates them from Jews. What Jew denies that the Wisdom of God is *ὁμοούσιον* with God? Did the Catholic dogmata arise after the year of Christ 1300?

Who thought them out? Who propounded them? Who commanded that they should be believed by the whole world?

If we hearken to the Heretics, they say that our Scholastic Theologians are proud, disputatious, fond of altercation. Therefore they could not strike out the dogmata that we hold; for proud and disputing men are exposed to envy and emulation. If the Franciscans had invented the ternary number of persons, or the hypostatic union of the Word, or Transubstantiation, the Dominican Inquisitors would have cried out, or the Sorbonnists—formerly, as the tale runs, the enemies of both those Orders. Therefore the form of our religion is older than the Schools; it is before the “Fathers,” by whom it is opposed. Who then made the sons more skilled than the Fathers? Has a fifth Gospel fallen down from Heaven? How in the fourteenth century did the whole world cease to be atheist and become Christian? How did the Church of Christ then begin to be of sound mind?

CHAPTER III.

The method of the Monkish forgers explained : the necessity of writing a great mass of books in support of their theories : and of various kinds, alleged apocryphal books among them. The interest of the forgers in the Academy of Paris. Their Latinity differs from that of Pliny.

Section 1

THE forgers to whom I refer did what one of their impious band, "Theodoret, book I. *Fables of Heretics*, chap. xix.," declares that the Marcionitae did: *They wrote a multitude of opinions, and falsely-entitled books, to frighten fools!*

It was a great undertaking; it required great toil, which was given unsparingly by the Faction. They had in truth, as they hint, χαλκεντέρους, φιλοπόνους, *Adamantinos*, "unwearied, brazen-bowelled" scribblers. They were bound to forge almost countless literary monuments, that they might oppose an (alleged) written tradition of so many years to the non-written, that is, the Catholic Tradition. A vast number of volumes was prepared, because the wicked forgers knew that the more there were, the more difficult it would be to unravel the fraud. It was as necessary to forge about as many Greek as Latin books; otherwise it would forthwith be suspected that the fraud was done in the Latin world. Moreover, the consent of the Two Churches must be pretended and shown; this was the scheme which they carried out. They gave to

Greece, among the first, Gregory of Nazianzus, Chrysostom; to Cappadocia, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa; to the East, Theodoret, Eusebius; to Egypt, Clement, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril; to Italy, Ambrose, Leo, Gregory the Great; to Palestine and Syria, Justin, Cyril the second, Damascenus; to Cyprus, Epiphanius; to Africa, Tertullian, Cyprian, Optatus, Augustine, Fulgentius, etc.—besides almost countless others in various parts of the world.

Their design had to be supported by this vast num- *Section 2*
ber of volumes, histories, councils, writings of every kind; otherwise it was idle to undertake or attempt it at all. Do not wonder, then, at the multitude and mass of books! It had also to be set forth by means of polemical tracts, and in homilies to the people, and in explanations of the Scriptures, in Epistles, and in histories of various nations of the Christian world—that the form of Religion was that which they taught and handed down; that their opinions, their interpretations of the Scriptures, their solutions of opposites were not the sense of one man, or of one region or age, but of the whole world, and of all ages.

Again: it was necessary to produce this vast and *Section 3*
massive literature, so that no one might dare to withstand the multitude of alleged “witnesses.” If any dared this, he would at once be exposed to the censure of desiring to destroy all tradition. For not one of those volumes, considered separately, can escape condemnation as heretical or atheistic. But when it appears that all the Writers of the Faction agree with each member, even Catholics themselves shrink back;

they dare reject none; nay, they feel compelled to admit and embrace the whole.

Section 4 Very many "Fathers" had to be forged. If one only or two, or twenty, or if in Latin only, forthwith the fraud would have been discovered; and so in like manner, if only "Fathers," and not also historians, both sacred and profane, had been contrived! It was necessary also to invent imaginary adversaries: Manicheans, Arians, Donatists, and a host of others.

Section 5 It was necessary to invent a multitude of questions, decrees, canons, definitions, formulæ of prayers, histories, controversies, etc., so that whatever difficulty might arise in the matter of Religion, whether pertaining to dogma or to discipline, the point might appear to have been long ago defined and laid down according to the principles of atheism and natural religion; and that posterity might not dare to decree otherwise than they read that their ancestors had defined. Everything had to be most diligently foreseen and cared for; no scholastic question of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Sacraments, must escape them; no contention on ecclesiastical discipline must be passed by.

Section 6 It was part of the plan that the writings should be continued through all ages, through each century, lest they should be considered fictions, and the artists should be thought to have stuck fast at the point where they had expounded their whole system. They had to cut it into parts, and to allot a part to each century. They desired to produce the illusory and false impression that gradually in the course of ages, the faith and sense of the faithful concerning the Mysteries, and also their discipline, had grown little by little, and so

had arrived at the point at which they were when they devised the whole system.

It was the interest of these rogues to toil without *Section 7* ceasing, to persist in forging false monuments of former times and of their own; to load and overwhelm the world with them; so that no others might appear or be read, if possible, except those which were imbued with their own doctrines.

But these impostors could not, and dared not, pro- *Section 8* pose the whole of their impiety to their own age, unless by word of mouth in colloquies. They aimed more at tricking and deluding posterity. The Catholic Tradition being openly opposed to them, yet Religion being matter of Tradition, how could they pervert their contemporaries by the immediate production of so many false testimonies? So, as I have said, they had greater hope of deceiving posterity.

It was necessary to forge Apocryphal writings, so *Section 9* that the world might believe that they had Critics among them; and that thus other writings might acquire more credit, the fairer or the more severe they seemed to be in noting and denouncing alleged "apocrypha." But what was the origin of these fictions? Where were the Apocrypha written? Among the Romans especially—as the Clementines, and other writings assigned to Peter, and "Hermas," or "the Pastor." Men were not to believe that writings of Rome, or by Romans, had formerly been received with so much reverence as writings by others than the Romans; to which last authority was given by the suffrage of all. Not that those apocryphal writings contain anything pertinent to dogma which they would

not have believed; but that they are unwilling to have it believed that doctrines were held to be true, because they came from the Romans.

Sect. 10-11 Designedly also they produced works which they desired to be considered by many supposititious, at least by the more knowing; and they determined to supply in other writings proofs of the spuriousness of these works. Their interest was to produce these works, because they would please certain churches or districts. So they were produced; but care was taken to insert at least a part of the poison of their false Doctrine. Such are the books of "Dionysius the Areopagite," which they knew must be greedily accepted by the Greeks, and possibly by the Parisians. Such were the Decretal Epistles of the Popes, which they hoped would be pleasing to the Romans. So they expected to gain their ends, even by those works which more learned men held to be spurious, so long as they were deemed genuine by ignorant persons. I say, the impious crew might hope, if their fraud were not detected in the course of a generation, that they would have patrons, partly men like themselves, atheists, and supporters of their impiety; partly simpletons, incapable of detecting their craft and their fraud.

Section 12 There is a very large number of works which are now considered to be spurious by the erudite; although they had formerly appeared under the great names of "Athanasius, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine," and others, and bear those names in manuscripts. No wonder! The doctrine is the same with that of the others; there is the same turn of thought; they are inspired by the same faction and workshop. Why are

they not praised by Ambrose, for example, or by Augustine? Because they were concocted by a literary confederate, in the hope of their appearing under so great a name. But they afterwards appeared to the leading artificer in fiction less worthy of the great name, because they seemed to depart a little from certain of his opinions; or they were a little too bold in the expression of opinions which the leading artificer thought should be dissimulated.

Now and again, on the other hand, and not infrequently, the workman so divided his work that it was handed over to two writers; he pretended that the latter contained the writing of the earlier after his death. But the likeness of the style shows that the workman was one and the same in each part. So Robert de Monte is feigned to have continued Sigebert; and there are many other cases of the same device. Mabillon was forced to point out in his work on *Monastic Studies* (*de Stud. Monasticis*, p. 301), that disciples imitated the style of their masters, as "Nicolas of Clairvaux" imitated that of "Bernard of Clairvaux." So they multiplied names, and so they appeared to augment the number of writers and of false witnesses! Section 13

Again: They tried to persuade the world that many works had been lost. There is hardly one of them who does not tell a lying tale about writings of his, which are not to be found. So it is for example, that "Theodoret" adduces in his epistles the titles of books, as he alleges, written by him; and so in almost countless cases. Section 14

Section 15 The work was so divided among them that two or three or more writers undertook to work up the writings of one Age. And when two or three wrote on a similar subject or argument, one purposely passed by that which was to be added by the other. For example: —“Epiphanius, Theodoret, Augustine,” and others, wrote on “Heresies.” One touches on certain Heresies, neglected by another; one spoke more openly, the other more darkly of some one heresy.

Section 16 That posterity might not wonder or suspect conspiracy and fraud, when they saw that all the “Fathers” treated the same arguments, all of them, and employed the same reasonings and similitudes so that one often seems to copy another; it was necessary to invent Histories by which it might appear that the same “Heresies” had been scattered in the whole world, and must therefore be everywhere assailed. For that reason they planted the Arians in Asia, in Egypt, in Greece, in Africa, in the Gauls, in Spain; the Manichaeans everywhere; the Photinians in Gaul; others elsewhere.

Section 17 Some one may say: “Could men take so much pains in framing so many false books?” As if when the *fact* is established, you may doubt of the way in which it was done! It is a *fact* that there were men who wrote these books; and it is manifest by recent examples of heretics, that bad men write many more and thicker volumes to defend error, than Catholics to defend Truth. Compare the monstrous loads, rather than volumes, under the names of Luther, Calvin, Brentius, the Magdeburg theologians, the *Fratres Poloni* and

others. You will understand that the impious faction spared no labour to establish their impiety!

But they also handled the same matter in many ways. You find, for example, the same arguments precisely in "Cyril of Alexandria's" Commentaries on John and in the Thesaurus, and in the Seven Dialogues; the form alone is slightly changed. "Ambrose" does the like, and so does "Augustine." So easy was it to produce many and great volumes in a short time.

Of the Greek and Latin "Fathers" there are not *Section 18* more works than were written within fifty years under the names of Luther, Calvin, and their followers. There are not so many works of "Augustine" as there are of "Tostatus" alone, or "Albertus Magnus" alone! As to Calvin's works, how much more cultivated is the style and manner! How much more abundant in every kind of learning are those of "Albertus Magnus!" If you expunge the constant iterations in Augustine, you will take away at least a fourth part of his works. In our own Society of Jesus there are seven writers, Salmeron, Vasquez, Suarez, Bellarmine, Cornelius à Lapide, Theophilus Raynaud, Petavius, whose books surpass in number and mass the so-called "Latin Fathers."

There were in the sixteenth century a great number of men of singular learning in Italy—Bembo, Manutius, Politiano, etc. If these men had conspired for some one design, how many works could they have put forth in Greek and Latin, in prose and verse, much more elegant and refined than any of those under the names of "Ambrose," "Augustine," and others? Of recent

writers, some vie with Tully himself, others with Virgil in literary ability.

Section 19 But the truth is that most of those alleged "old writers" are *describers*, so to speak, rather than independent writers. They are copyists, as "Rufinus" and "Cyril" of "Augustine," "Ambrose" of "Philo" or "Basil," or "Hilary" on Ps. cxviii. "Justin," though he is reckoned earlier, copies "Theodoret," "Theophylact," "Æcumenius," and both of them copy "Chrysostom," etc.

They did not, like our Commentators, search for the true and genuine sense of Letters; this is sometimes painful; but they set down whatever allegories came into their heads, very often frigid and senseless, that others might copy them; for nearly all have the same things. It is fearfully tedious, therefore, to read them. And so, almost with running pen, they wrote these works, especially sermons, as they sometimes boast, in the course of one night. Sidonius makes that statement about himself.

"Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodoret, Justin," were really possessors of *one* library; they praise the same authors, they confute the same stories. And so with others.

Section 20 Amongst these writers, those who desired to be thought the later, more clearly explain controverted points, and others not touched by the alleged earlier writers. They so distributed the task of writing, that something should be reserved for the alleged later ones, to distinguish them from the alleged earlier. For if you except the fuller explanations, you will find that the "later" write precisely the same things with

the "earlier." Something new must be added that the "later" might not be held useless. At the same time it was necessary to repeat what the former had said, and so the volume was thickened; which would otherwise have been slight and meagre.

How came it to pass that from the "Seventh Century" to the "Fifteenth Century" you scarce find seven writers in Spain? Why, the impious gang would persuade you that all the writers of that period flourished, or taught, or learned what they wrote, at Paris. Their object was to stir up the Academy of Paris, which (they said) was rising during the same period, to defend their writings. Hence they alleged that nearly all Germans, Italians, English, studied or taught at Paris; "Alcuin, Raban, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura," and countless others.

Those most unprincipled literary craftsmen thought that if they could gain the patronage of the Academy of Paris, the whole of France would follow, and France is the best part of Christendom. From England, I say, from Italy and Germany, they tell how many writers came; but they are said to have studied or even taught at Paris.

They who are represented as having written in the *Section 21* "Ninth Century," and "Bede" in the "Eighth Century," simply copy alleged earlier writers; little else. They had exhausted their plots and arguments; but to keep up appearances, and to prevent the earlier writings (which were opposed by the traditions from the eighth or ninth century) from appearing mendacious; they mostly copy or augment only the former

writings; and they feign new controversies about them.

In the alleged thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it is remarkable how often the like or the same things are copied down on the Holy Spirit, or Unleavened Bread, and other heads of theology, on which the Greeks differ from the Latins. The impious gang were deeply interested that no other records of the controversy about the "procession of the Holy Ghost" should appear than their own fictions; that neither God nor the Holy Ghost should seem in those disputes other than they had stated; for they would not acknowledge the true God.

Section 22 The faction had artificers skilled in every style. But their Latinity is always different from that of Pliny, and other old Latin. Their Latin is closely alike in all, betraying that all were of the same age. Nothing but prejudice will suffer you to disbelieve this. Some are nevertheless more accurate and polite than others. All have a bold way of writing; they follow like cadences and like desinences; but they do not equally cultivate elegance and brilliancy (nitor) of composition. Most of them give little heed to good writing; their object is to write quickly. None was delayed in the publication of his work by censors.

Section 23 If all wrote on the same method, the scholastic, for example, there would not have been enough writers for all ages; their material would have been soon exhausted. Therefore the alleged earlier writers were bidden to write Apologies, Epistles, Tractates against Heretics, and Homilies. Those who were alleged to be "Middle Age" writers were bidden to write Commen-

taries, and Collectanea from the "Fathers," that is, from those who had given earlier lucubration. Lastly, they were bidden to frame Theological Summae, and Commentaries on the Summae.

Some writings they allege to be of uncertain authorship—the object being that in a following age they should be attributed to some man of great name, and so authority might be added to the false opinions of the impious faction.

CHAPTER IV.

The Holy Apostolic See has nothing to do with the question of the genuineness of the books ascribed to "Augustine, Jerome," and others of the Monkish faction. On the contrary, none must dare to question the authorship of Matthew's Gospel, because of the testimony of the Church and the Holy Spirit in its favour. The like holds of the writings ascribed to "Peter, Paul, Luke or Mark."

Here Hardouin is a priestly sophist: for those writings are part of the great system of forgery, placed under the names of the "Illustrious Men." Hardouin pretends that the Saints were real persons, though ignorant and illiterate: which is a quite baseless assumption. He shows that the Protestants have more reason to dread the exposure of the "Fathers" than the Catholics: and maintains the fiction of an oral Apostolic Tradition apart from any writings. He would confine the Church to the Vulgate Bible, and a few other authorities, all of which can be proved to be modern. He continues his attack on Augustine's writings as the source of
all heresies.

Section 1 **I**F the Holy Apostolic See should be consulted as to its opinion on the books of "Augustine, Jerome," and the rest, the Holy Apostolic See will, I suppose, answer most wisely, that she has nothing to do with the matter; that she has had no revelation on these matters; whether they are, or are not of those writers, whose names they bear. She would say that this had no bearing upon the deposit entrusted to her. Let learned men quarrel upon these matters as they will. Her interest in the meantime is this alone—the tenets

of the Catholic faith, the principles of Morals, according to the deposit entrusted to her (especially where on these two heads any strife arises among the faithful) she defines and decides, according to the power granted to her by Christ.

If I were to say that I had reasons and arguments *Section 2* by which to prove that the gospel of Matthew was not Matthew's, every one would forthwith turn from me and execrate me; would absolutely refuse to listen to those reasons; would utterly and immediately close his ears, as to blasphemy. Rightly so! and why? Because every Christian understands that this opinion is opposed to the testimony of the Church, yea, and of the Holy Spirit, who pronounced the Gospel of Matthew to be Matthew's. Therefore, on the contrary, when any one is prepared to hear reasons which I may bring before him—and I am justified in adducing what reasons I will—in proof of the allegations that this or that work ascribed to "Augustine, Basil," or any other is not genuine; this is a most certain argument that there is no extant judgment of the Church which asserts that any work, for example, of those in circulation under Augustine's name, is really Augustine's.

The Church never examined the writings of Peter *Section 3* or Paul, because they were the Masters of the whole Church, and first disciples of Christ, or first disciples of His disciples—such as Luke and Mark. Enough it was for her to know that these writings were Peter's or Paul's, Luke's or Mark's, so that she might pronounce them, without any examination, free from the slightest error of any kind. In the recognition of this

fact she must not possibly err; her knowledge, diffused abroad, was necessary, and ought to be most certain.

But it is not enough that certain self-styled learned men should believe or say that something had been written by some bishop, say "Augustine or Chrysostom:" the Church will not necessarily confirm this.

You may say that Antiquity believed these books of Augustine in our hands to be genuine. Do you not know that Antiquity is a mother full of errors? Four hundred years ago men might write and read, and believe falsehoods. Do you not know that of the very books of those "Fathers" whom Antiquity believed to be genuine, very many have been condemned by our own age, with the applause of learned men?

Section 4

I spoke of the notice of the fact, spread abroad, in reference to the writers of the Sacred Books. I said that it was necessary to the Church, and exposed to no error. So in reference to definition of genuine Councils, such as that of Trent, and Constitutions of Popes—I mean the genuine ones—the same notice is both necessary to the Church, and as revelation itself, is most certain and undoubted, or assuredly stands in stead of revelation.

Such is the published notice by which we hold that the Constitution *Unigenitus* was put forth by Clement XI. Of the same condition is the evidence, by which it was of old agreed among the first Christians that Matthew's Gospel was Matthew's, that Paul's Epistles were Paul's, and so of the rest.

By those first Christians all Posterity was taught,

so that on the foundation of faith there could not be the slightest doubt.

Of the writings of the "Fathers," absolutely nothing of the kind could be said. You cannot make me believe that the Church even knew, or that the Church even proposed to the faithful that they should certainly believe, that this or that work was certainly "Augustine's" or "Jerome's." If MS. Books put forward the name of Augustine or another, yet the contents show heresy or even atheism; I would not believe them to be the product of a Saint or of a Catholic. No! not though such book bore the name of any Angel from heaven! I would rather believe it to be the work of a dæmon transfigured into an angel of light!

If the writers called "Fathers" are not such, retain them, embrace them; but if they are of that kind, then abominate and detest them! Show that such is not their quality, if you can; I tell you that with God's help, my purpose is to make it clear, that all, without exception, are of that quality. Three of them I have quite done with. All the rest are affected.

Necessarily, *all* the writings which I condemn are *Section 5* supposititious, or *none* of them is. The latter is not true; the former therefore is most true. Those forgers so arranged among themselves, and there is so great consent of opinion among them that, if but one of the monuments which they have invented falls away, the whole must necessarily collapse in ruin. They felt this, they knew that the thing would seem strange and incredible to posterity. Yet it is this very fact—their mutual consent—which shows the fraud. The like

phenomenon does not occur in books published after the invention of Printing. If one of these books be proved false, it is unnecessary for you forthwith to overthrow all the rest, which were published in the same year and in the same city.

Section 6 The second most certain sign of conspiracy and consent is that scarce any one of those false "Fathers" can be rightly understood, unless *all* are read and understood. So they shed light upon one another. All the doctrines of their impious hypothesis are contained in all their writings. If therefore I condemn some one of them for atheism, for example, which he infers in his demonstration of the existence of God, it is vain to oppose to me some other of the same band who thinks the same; this is merely to call a thief like a thief. Are they not both thieves?

Section 7 He indeed would deserve severe censure who should say that the holy Fathers, whether the whole or one of them, "Augustine, Irenaeus," and the like, either taught atheism or thought otherwise than good Catholics on any article of the faith. He who so speaks ought to be condemned by the bishops. For it is incredible that the Church paid the worship of saints to those men whose writings, infected by so many and so great errors, were in the hands of all. In my judgment none could be held saints, except those whose faith was seen and acknowledged, and whose morals were approved. But it is quite another thing to say that the name of St. Irenaeus, a thorough Catholic, has been falsely affixed to a heretical and nefarious work; for this is to say that from the beginning the Catholic faith, as it now is, was in the minds of holy

men; but the impostors desired it to be believed other than it truly is. If this can be proved by certain arguments and documents, who can deny that this is in the interests of the Catholic faith? Who can deny that this very dictum of the false "Augustine (book xviii., chap. xxxviii.,)" of the *De Civitate Dei*) is rightly laid down:—*These writings the chastity of the Canon did not receive; not because the authority of those men who were pleasing to God is rejected, but because the writings are not believed to be theirs?* Assuredly it is far better, with a view to preserve the reverence due to holy bishops and Fathers, to show that impious writings were ascribed to their names, than to profess with Melchior Canus that the Eliberitan Fathers, for example, had *spoken impiously in canon xxxvi.*, or with Launoy to affirm that Augustine was a Predestinarian, or with Ambrosius Catharinus to pronounce, *The opinion asserted by St. Augustine and by St. Thomas is cruel, truculent, and impels men to despair; the authority of these Doctors is not held in such esteem that we should be oppressed by it, and embrace with our eyes shut a manifest LIE.*

The impious men selected at some time holy men out Section 8
of the Religious Families, under whose names they might publish their impious writings; although the men were celebrated when they lived, not for their knowledge, but for their sanctity. Wherefore it was necessary to pretend that they had that knowledge, and skill in writing divinely infused into them, though they were rude even in Grammar. See in the Roman Breviary the Lectons concerning S. Antoninus, for the 10th of May, and S. Laurence Justinianus for the

5th of September. But neither from their hands nor from that of Thomas Aquinas is a solitary written letter extant, out of so many philosophical and theological works ascribed to them.

Section 9 I know that all Protestants must be stirred up more than others by these arguments, for they take it amiss that the patrons of their error are snatched from them, together with a Tradition founded only on parchments. If you cannot believe the "Fathers," they will say, whom are you to believe? Not the "Fathers," say I, but our Holy Mother, the Roman Church, although I also believe in the Fathers, whom she has declared to be truly holy Fathers. I recognise in that quality, because of their power over the Church, as over sheep and sons, all the supreme Pontiffs from Peter to Benedict XIII. For them each one of the whole of Catholic Christendom says "Our Holy Father," and each one of them is Father of Fathers, Father of the Episcopal Senate, and *Papa*, that is, Pastor of Pastors.

Catholics do not need any old writings; even if they had all perished, the unwritten Tradition persevering both in the Holy Roman Church and in all the churches of the world before the rise of Heresies, suffices for them. But since heretics did afterwards arise, that they may not appear new and fresh, there is need of some witnesses whom they may show to be on their side, whom they may put forward as the true witnesses to the faith of the Church in their time, able interpreters of the Sacred Scripture, and favourers none the less of their party by heretical comments. They take it amiss that these arms are snatched from them.

But God forbid that His Church should need or *Section 10* should use false witnesses or testimonies. The Church of God could stand without even any divine Scripture, and so in point of fact did stand before the Gospel written by Luke; she relied upon the Apostolic tradition alone; even as she now also stands upon the sole institution of Pastors, and communion with the Apostolic See of the great majority of Christian folk. How much more is she able to stand apart from the writings of those called "Fathers," whose thoughts are so wicked that they are variously received, because of the perplexity of the language, even by the Catholic defenders of them?

When there is proposed to the Church or the Apostolic See any controversy concerning the destruction of the faith, is there any need to consult Books (I mean the so-called "Fathers") that what is to be believed may be defined? If so, it would mean that the Church was previously ignorant of what she should believe. God forbid that any one should think or say so. He is ignorant of his faith, who knows not whether a proposition is contrary to his faith. Therefore, setting aside and neglecting those books, the Church and the Apostolic See can and ought to define controversies of faith, and verily she does so. Why should the Church enquire, with the object of defining any controversy on the faith—what Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and others thought? Ought the Church to be taught by them? If those writers were Catholics and Doctors, did they not themselves learn from her? Did she herself forget what she taught them?

Section 11 Alas! to what a pass has our holy Religion come! No longer do men ask, no longer are Christians satisfied to know what Christ taught, what Peter, John, or Paul thought; they want to know how the alleged Augustine understood the words of Christ, or of Peter, John, or Paul. As if this ought to be the norm and rule; or that among these born of women there had arisen none greater than your "Augustine." He must have been more illuminated by God than all sacred writers, than Peter, Paul, and the rest; we must think that they spoke obscurely or less accurately, unless they agree with Augustine, who spoke with greater clearness and fullness! Christ does not please, Paul does not please; they will not have the words of Paul, or of Christ, except with the interpretation of Augustine! Here is a new Paul, a new Christ! No longer is the Gospel consulted, but Augustine and his contemporaries!

The object of all this was to make the unskilled doubt whether the faith of the Church is the same to-day as in the age of Augustine; for the forgers themselves clearly understand, that nothing can be said more contrary and adverse to the faith of the Church than the false "Augustine" in all his chapters. And now men care less whether they may be Christians, than whether they be, and be called, Augustinians! Enough for me to be a Christian!

Addendum: The illustrious bishop of the church of Vapincum in his published Mandate, 4th March, 1712, justly and Catholically said among other things: "It is important that our clergy should be informed (a) that the authority of St. Augustine, and his opinion on

efficacious Grace have been the greatest pretexts that Luther and Calvin made use of to introduce their errors, and to elude the decisions of the Church; (b) that the opinions of St. Augustine on the matters of Grace do not fix belief, except in respect of the points decided by the Popes and by the Church; (c) that the manner of explaining the efficacy of Grace is not one of the articles on which we are obliged to follow the opinion of St. Augustine; (d) that the Schools even are not agreed what is the opinion of this holy Doctor on this; (e) that as little are they agreed which of the Thomist theologians or of their adversaries have best understood the sense of St. Thomas."

How greatly I could wish that from the Holy Apostolic See, or from the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, a Decree of this kind should proceed:—

"Since endless and interminable strifes are stirred up by Theologians about the sayings of the Old Writers; which quarrels, though they seem to be stirred up for the purpose of defending the faith, extinguish in some faith, in others charity; and since there is dispute among many learned men about the genuine or spurious quality of many of those writers; the Holy See prohibits henceforth the citation of those writings, whether from MSS. or from printed books commonly called of the Fathers or Doctors of the Church—whether in schools, theological disputations and theses, or in sermons—until the Holy Apostolic See defines and decrees concerning those writings. It prohibits the reading of them, except by Doctors who have received permission from the Bishops; and the said Doctors are to be first required by the bishops to

make protestation, that they will firmly adhere to the Sacred Vulgate Edition of the Bible by Clement VIII., to the Council of Trent, to the Constitution of the Apostolic See against all heresies and books favouring heresy, from Wyclif to the books proscribed by Benedict XIII. inclusively.

“It prohibits the citation, in the same schools, disputations, sermons, books, etc., of any recent writers who defend their affirmations by the authority of any of the aforesaid old writers; or who use other testimony in matters pertaining to Religion than some of the authorities just named—that is to say, the Vulgate Bible, the Council of Trent, the unwritten Tradition, and the constitutions of the supreme Pontiffs just indicated.” Ah, what peace would be brought to the Church by so Catholic a Decree, and so worthy of the Apostolic See!

Addendum:—Du Pin said well in his *Treatise of Christian Doctrine*, i. 12, p. 285: “Thus the authority of a single Father, or even of several, is by no means an infallible proof of the truth of a dogma. There could be only one occasion on which it *could* be maintained that we were obliged to yield to the opinions of an author; to wit, in case the Church had approved of his doctrine, and had received it as being of Apostolic Tradition. But it would not suffice for that, that she gave *praises* to an author, or that she approved *in general* his writings and his doctrine; it would be necessary that she should mark in particular what is the doctrine that she approves. The *general* approbation of the doctrine of an author

does not carry with it a particular approbation of each article."

Therefore Arnauld rashly writes: "After the decision of the Church we may not believe to-day without heresy that there can be errors in the works of St. Augustine"—that is, after the Epistles (as alleged) of Celestine and Hormisdas. Rashly, and with a sense inducing to heresy, the Jansenist taught what Alexander VIII. condemned—prop. XXX. "Where any shall find a doctrine clearly founded in Augustine, he may absolutely hold and teach it, without regard to any Pope's bull." More cautiously did the archbishop of Cambray teach, in Letters written as "Dialogues against the Jansenists," praef. xxxiii., "The text of St. Augustine has no authority but that which the Church gives it, and *in the only sense that the Church judges fitting to give it.*"

If Paul in his Epistles has no discussion or mention Section 13 of "Grace efficacious by itself," nothing of "predestination before merits foreseen"—which opinions are held in the schools—then Augustine, who taught otherwise, brought a new and other Gospel into the world. I have shown in my paraphrase of Paul's Epistles that he did not teach those doctrines. But what does he say of those who suffer themselves to be carried away into another Gospel? It is not only *another* Gospel—that of the false Augustine—it is a contrary Gospel, a *Kakangelion*. I acknowledge the unique and only Gospel of Jesus Christ, according to the four Evangelists, and the sacred and divinely inspired Epistles, according to the sense of the holy Roman Church. I do not acknowledge the Gospel of the false

Augustine, and the like. I call it on the contrary a singular providence of God, that he has not permitted hitherto any book of Augustine to be named with approval or commendation by the Holy See, or by any alleged old Councils whether Gallican or German, or Spanish, or other.

Section 14 As Fathers I own all Bishops, who in the Catholic faith, and communion with the holy Apostolic See, have departed this life; and especially those whom out of that order the Church has enrolled among the Saints. These were truly Doctors of the Church; because of themselves or by others, they taught sound doctrine in the Church. This is why in the Office of Confessor Pontiffs, it is truly said of all holy Bishops, *All the earth is full of his Doctrine*. For what are Fathers as Fathers, but Doctors of the Church? The holy Bishops are praised for the doctrine with which they have filled all the earth, that is, the Church. Nor does the Church enrol any of that or other order in the list of Saints, unless their faith as well as their morals have been approved by her. But the writings of the "Fathers" which are in circulation are a scripture against Scripture, an impious against a sacred Scripture. Wherefore those impious tricksters contrived that in the Roman Breviary more should be read from the Fathers, in the Lections, than out of the Sacred Scripture.

Section 15 No heresy has been more pernicious to Christianity, or can be, than that which now flourishes; none that will be more durable, unless care is soon taken to avert so great an evil. That heresy will contend that there is no Tradition of God, of Christ, of the Sacraments,

but that contained in the "old books of the Fathers," as they call them, and also in the Missals, Breviaries, and other Ecclesiastical books.

Against so great a mischief it should be timely taught that prelates and others might be deceived when they took up such books, so interpolated, as if they would not hurt the orthodox; that the Church meanwhile, so far as matters of faith are concerned, was not deceived, nor could be deceived. The most evident proof of this is, that her belief is widely different from that conveyed by the language of those books, and from the sense intended by the author; those excepted which are excerpts from the sacred books of the Vulgate edition, and the forms of the sacraments.

Noxious beyond expression has hitherto been erudi- *Section 16*
tion and science, commonly so called, to Christianity. And now the ignorance of the fraud against Christianity contrived by atheists in days gone by is noxious to her beyond expression. Therefore now is the time that true science should aid in promoting and defending Christianity; but the most important part of the work is the laying bare of the fraud which learned men of false name devised with the object of overthrowing religion; and the diligent and accurate confutation of that fraud.

CHAPTER V.

The analogy between the theories of Rabbins and Monks; to Prophets and Wise Men correspond Fathers and Scholastics. The theory of the Monks ridiculed.

Section 1 **T**HEY say that the Jewish Rabbins are wont to declare of the times of Ezra: "*So far there were Prophets, afterwards follow the Wise Men.*"

They who forged the writings of the "Fathers" desired that it should be believed that the like had occurred in the Church. "*Down to Bernard there were Fathers,*" they say; "*then the Scholastics down to Thomas*"; and "*after him all were babes.*" An evident argument that, after Bernard's times, these rascals began to scheme and build up their system of fraud.

Section 2 Why, prithee, or how, did the "Fathers" displease the Church? You cannot doubt that they *did* displease the Church, seeing that for more than 500 years she calls none "Fathers"! By what decree, at what place or time, by what authority was this laid down? I tell you that in my judgment the Church had and has in every age Fathers; I mean Bishops conspicuous for learning and holiness. For me one Father is St. Francis Sales, another is St. Charles Borromeo; there are many others. Fathers of any other kind the Church never had.

Strange blindness of mankind! In those first times *Section 3* of the Church, they reckon among the Fathers any writer on Religion, a bishop of any obscure town, a presbyter, a monk, a layman; every one of them is to be reverentially adopted. After the "Twelfth Century," not a Bishop, or Archbishop, not even a Pope, if he write anything, is held to be a "Father." Is it not madness?

I know the cause; those alleged old writers had the afflatus of the divine Spirit; not so with those who lived "after Bernard,"—or there were very few of them! You may tell me that Augustine had been a Manichean, and a vicious young man, that Ambrose had been a Prefect and a layman, that Chrysostom had been a lawyer and a special pleader! You may tell me that all, after their conversion, became suddenly men of learning, and fit to teach others! You may tell me—more wonderful still!—that all were equally learned, all accomplished in the same matters—the same heresies and controversies—and that they write in a sublime style that can now only be appreciated by men of learning and genius!

CHAPTER VI.

The depravation of Scripture by the monkish faction. Hardouin's blind adherence to the Vulgate Edition. The frauds in the Greek Codices. Hardouin vainly attempts to meet the objection that the genuineness of the Vulgate is no more certain than that of the Benedictine *diplomata*. He dogmatically defends the books of the New Testament, and denounces the allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

Section 1 **F**IRST and above all, the careful desire of the impious gang was to deprave the Sacred Scripture, because it utterly made an end of their impious principles. They had to make it agree with them. And so their first and chief task was to learn the Sacred Scriptures by heart, to weave Concordances and to make out Commentaries, to corrupt the text, to leave no jot or tittle intact that might be opposed to their principles; to depart as far as possible from the Vulgate Edition; and because they could not adulterate that Book, because they knew it was against them, altogether and utterly, they had to feign that it was recent, as compared with the Greek Books (Codices), which they declared to be far more ancient!

Section 2 Of the Vulgate Scripture I say what the false "Augustine" says of Sacred Books, in lxxxiii, quaest. 68:—*The Books which the Catholic discipline guards, we by no means think to have been forged.*

No! and I contend they cannot have been forged. No book of any religion or superstition, after it has once come into the hands of the members of the sect, and has been held sacred, can be adulterated, except by those who would destroy the same form of religion. Not even the Koran could be so corrupted!

So neither could the Vulgate Edition, from the time it began to be in the use of the faithful, be corrupted; especially seeing that Deity aided the conservation of that Book!

The impious band, having no hope of corrupting the sacred Latin Books, which were in everybody's hands, turned their attention to the making of Greek Books, and to the adulteration of Hebrew copies, which they wrote in elegant caligraphy. They also corrupted Latin books, which they hid in Libraries; because the old Vulgate could not be snatched from the hands of the whole Christian people, everywhere diffused. And the books which they had corrupted could not be scattered among all towns, in all Christian dioceses and parishes. Therefore they hid those Hebrew copies and those adulterated Latin books, and the Greek books they had made up, in Libraries; their design being to take them out thence at suitable times, like weapons from armouries, with the object of attacking the Catholic Faith.

They also invented various readings in the Greek *Section 3* Codices (or Manuscripts) that they might persuade readers that there had been the like in Latin books in days of yore; and that these Various Readings existed in books which they had laid up in Libraries. And now any rogue or liar may invent the like various

readings, as they call them! I tell you that if I desired to invent a Greek MS., and to send from it "various readings" to Oxford—where they are preparing a new edition of the New Testament—I should cry up my MS. with a great pomp of words; I should take care to get a place for my reading among the rest of the readings. And in the first instance a few, and soon many, would appreciate it.

But, tell me, why are the Greek MSS. exposed to an injury that does not affect the Vulgate Edition? Because—this is the answer—the Vulgate is in the hands of all. Were I to corrupt my MS., I could not wound thereby another copy either of the same city or of the same House; I could not injure the rest of the copies in the Christian world. The fact is that the Greek MSS. are turned over by the learned class alone; and it is believed that they have not yet been brought out of the Libraries—not all of them.

Section 4 I say that Scripture was not given by God to be laid up in Libraries. Sacred Books were not written—before the rise of the impious faction—to be placed there; they were written to be read by the purchasers. And therefore it was impossible that any of those copies should be corrupted without the instant detection of the fraud. The wicked faction invented the suspicions against the accuracy and certainty of the Vulgate Edition, intact and sound though it be; hoping that their forged MSS., laid up on the shelves of the Libraries, might obtain authority partly from their alleged antiquity, partly from the testimony of other books. They hoped that credit would be given to their smoky volumes, that posterity would think

their copies must be emended by them; and that so the Vulgate Edition would everywhere and at the same time and once for all lose its authority. But they only convinced heretics, or the like of themselves, or men of learning falsely so called. They increased the bulk of their own MSS. by adding two Books under the name of Esdras—the third and the fourth—and other matters. But they have been repudiated by the Church, because she had not owned them from the beginning, and because they were absent from those copies which were in the possession of the whole Christian public.

But if in the sacred books of the Old and New Testament which have been written in Greek, there is manifest corruption, falsation, adulteration; it should be manifest that the falsation was practised for the purpose of overthrowing Religion; not in those books only, but in all others in which the like indications of falsity appear. For if their audacity was so great in the case of the sacred books, how much more easily could they carry out their design in volumes falsely placed under the names of Augustine, Ambrose, and other saints!

A certain Benedictine objected to Father Germon that his principles lead to Pyrrhonism. It was a mad saying; for none could entertain such a suspicion except a man who reasoned thus: "The incorruptness of the Vulgate Edition is not more certain than are our Diplomata. Therefore he who throws doubt on those Diplomata also questions and throws doubt on the antiquity and incorruptness of the Vulgate Edition." The same thing may be said of the writings

commonly believed to be of the "Fathers," and of the Benedictine Diplomata. But let him be held a mad or impious man who says that the Vulgate Edition is not of more certain antiquity than any other writings whatever—and for the reason I have given—the testimony of the Church, first the Roman, then the universal Church throughout the world.

Section 7 The sacred books of the New Testament are therefore sacred, as I said, because they were written by the Apostles whom the Lord Christ willed to be teachers and masters of the world, or writers of his deeds with Apostolic authority. But if there is no God but Right Reason, or Natural Light, or the Truth of all eternal truths (for these terms amount to the same thing) there is no cause why these writers should see into Right Reason more than others. On this account a like authority was given by the impious band to Augustine and others called "Fathers," with that given to the Sacred Writers. Nor would they have it believed that so great authority was acquired by them because they had been chosen for the purpose by Christ or the Apostles, but because of the consent of many Churches, which was given in course of time. Therefore these false scribes pretended that certain writings of the Apostles, as Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, John's second and third, those under the names of Jude and James, and the Apocalypse, had long been doubted and called into question. In the second place they forged the name of the Apostles themselves, Peter, Andrew, Paul, and others, to writings which they knew must always be repudiated. Their design was that the Apostolic writings which

we possess should not be thought to have been received in the Church because they are Apostolic; but because at length they were adopted by many Churches. Thus they desired to obtain authority for the third and fourth book of Esdras, but they could not do so against the force of true Tradition. Thirdly and lastly, they desired the world to believe that the books of Wisdom of Solomon, of Ecclesiasticus, of Judith, of Tobias, and of the Maccabees had not yet been received into the Canon in the twelfth century. They made their "Hugo of St. Victor" say this, notwithstanding that these books are read in the Church.

In that impious hypothesis from which it follows *Section 8* that the written word of God is nothing but the word of universal Reason, it is necessary that all the precepts of the Law, ceremonial and positive, should be allegorically explained; and not they alone, but all historical facts whatever, for universal Reason cannot dictate any but universal and moral precepts. Hence arises the necessity for allegorising the whole of Scripture; and this Catholics detest. But that the practice might not appear strange, the wicked faction forged precepts under the names of Pythagoras and others, which it would be quite absurd to understand in a strictly literal sense. They desired it to be inferred that it would be absurd to understand the Mosaic precepts by the letter alone. For the same reason they invented fables on similar lines to the most true narratives of Sacred Scripture; so that both should be equally accepted as symbolical facts which Nature everywhere affords, and everywhere equally applies for the restraint and teaching of men. Thus it was

easy to explain allegorically the temporal promises of the Old Testament. But in the historical books it was impossible to explain petitions for temporal goods, and grants of them, or the infliction of temporal punishments by God allegorically. And therefore they hardly wrote a Commentary on Tobias, Judith, Esther, and Maccabees. These books they would have you believe to be of a second class.

CHAPTER VII.

State of Letters about A.D. 1300: no Greek Bible extant. The schism of the Greeks began with the monkish faction. *The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone* is their invention. Also the Byzantine History. The fiction of "the translation of the Empire," and its design. When did the Greeks depart from the Roman Rite? The mass of Greek MSS. are to be found in France, and not in the East: whither they appear to have been carried by the Benedictines. Further exposure of the style of the alleged Greek "Fathers."

[T is now at last clear to me that before the beginning *Section 1* of the fourteenth century, or at the end of the thirteenth, the Greeks had no Bible but the Latin; no Liturgy but the Latin; even as now in the Indies and the whole of America. It is, I say, manifest to me, that they had not the Greek Bible before that time, nor even the Psalter. The Greek Bible in our hands is fearfully corrupt, and got up to favour the impious hypothesis, which denies there is any true God. It is on that account the Greeks have not yet the Old Testament printed; because they never had one common and certain text, the MS. *codices* differing very greatly from one another. They have not been able to agree upon one certain context, as they say, to be selected, as they did agree in the case of the New Testament, but only from the year 1638.

The error on the Procession of the Holy Spirit from *Section 2* the Father alone, sprang from the impious faction

solely, *alone*. Nothing is more certain. Permanence (*manentia*) in Being (*esse*)—that is in their impious hypothesis the Holy Spirit—Being or Proceeding (*procession* being understood metaphorically) can only be from Being or Essence; and this to the impious conspiracy is the Father; from the Truth of Being, or the Son, the Spirit has not his essence, but from Essence alone. Therefore the schism of the Greeks took rise entirely from the impious faction, and at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century at the earliest. And therefore it was at that time that Greece changed the rites of the sacraments, which before it had in common with the Roman Church; those alone excepted which the Holy Apostolic See still recognises in her. What follows from these things I leave for the present to the consideration of others.

Section 3 All the Greek writings—of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and the rest, are so like one another, in the very words as well as in the opinions (one writer clearly copies another, as Bessarion, Caleca, and so in other cases) that all must have been contrived at one time and in the same workshop. That is to say: all writings alleged to be of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, must have been forged at the end of the thirteenth, or beginning of the fourteenth, under this or that name, or no name at all. The names were added, with certain temporal circumstances, in order that they might appear to be the works of those three ages.

Section 4, With great zeal, toil, and perseverance, they thought

they must write a Byzantine History as one of their first efforts; they must write also a series of Greek Books down to about the times of Leo X.; because in that tract of time they had to place their "Councils," their heresies, and their Patriarchs. If the like of these things were said to have taken place in the West, the authors of the fable would be refuted by the constant silence of the provinces on all these matters. Therefore it was necessary that the Westerns should seem to have long been unaware of the doings in the East through so many ages. They must seem to learn that from books written in the East, as they alleged, and scattered through the whole West, about the time of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. Hence there are so many volumes of Byzantine History, hence so many Greek "Fathers," historic and other writers. But all of them really sprang from the impious workshop of the West.

They made up the story of the "translation of the *Section 5* Empire" to the East, so that the Bishop of Constantinople might believe himself to be Patriarch and Œcumenical and the equal of the Supreme Pontiff, and that he might get almost the whole East to believe this folly. Their object also was to allow the emperor of the Turks to boast of being the successor of Constantine, and that to him therefore belonged both empires, the Eastern and the Western. Annals of about the beginning of the sixteenth century allege this of Soliman.

They pretended that there were four Patriarchates *Section 6* in the East, intending the deduction to be drawn that it was becoming for four to be superior to one, the

fifth, and to overrule him in case he held an opinion contrary to the opinion and rite of the other four; for example, if he forbade the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, or decreed that the use of the unleavened bread was to be kept, and the like.

Section 7 It may be asked, how and when the Greeks were persuaded to change the Roman Rite, and to adopt that which they now have. I say that it seems to have been done at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century—occasion being taken from the hatred of the Greeks towards the Latins, who had been expelled on the recovery of Constantinople by the former. It was as easy to persuade them of this, as it was easy to persuade (as they say) Pope Gregory XI. that the office of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary was most ancient in the East, but in the West either unknown or obliterated; although the approbation of Pope Gregory XI. and the epistles of Charles V., King of France, on that matter are nowhere else extant than in the Victorine MS. 1-12. fol. 2. See Spondanus for the year 1372, num. IX. Nor was that office received into the Roman Breviary before the time of Pius III., and afterwards little by little in the West; elsewhere scarce sixty years later. That was at last done among the Greeks with the like ease with which Paul V. was persuaded that the solemnity of the Stigmata of St. Francis had lapsed and been forgotten, as is told in the old Lections of the Roman Breviary.

Section 8 I say that the impious crew persuaded the Constantinopolitans in the first instance—whence the

error easily flowed to others—in the fourteenth century; that the Latin Rite in the performance and administration of the Sacraments was recent, invented at Rome, or at least in the Latin world; and that the Romans brought it into Greece for the sake of enlarging their dominion; and that the Grecian Rite was older, as the Liturgies—which liturgies forsooth they had forged under the great names of Basil and Chrysostom—and other monuments showed.

The impious crew were extremely anxious to forge *Section 9* Greek Fathers and historical writers in great numbers, down to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks and later. They needed to do this in order to draw the Greeks over to their side by inventing and exaggerating the prerogative of the See of Constantinople; and to put scruples in the minds of the Latins who turned over these books, whether they were to stand by the dogmata and decrees of the learned and formerly more celebrated Greek Church (as they endeavoured to make men believe) rather than the Latin. For that purpose they hired Greek fugitives from their own country, and paid them to render into Greek what they themselves had first written in Latin or in French.

Hence it comes to pass that in the Royal and Colbertine Libraries there are many more Greek MSS. *Section 10* than in the whole of the East, as we have been told by eye-witnesses; because they were all written in France about the end of the fifteenth century. Hence many *Gallicisms* appear in these Greek writings. Some Latin writings, which they had not leisure or money enough to turn into Greek, were represented to be Latin translations from the Greek. Some turned into

Greek from the Latin were again turned into Latin, as the Synodicon, and the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. In France these craftsmen gave out that Acts of Councils and other Greek codices had been brought to them. The Easterns, on the other hand, were persuaded that they had been copied out of the Patriarchal Roman Church, to which they had first been transmitted. Thus one is feigned to have said in the 6th synod, Act XIV., p. 1363 of my Edition: *Coming from the West, I brought a book of the Fifth Council.* Then the *Collectio Graeca Regia* 2951 is feigned to have been written first at Rome in the year 774, and to have been made up out of those Acts. "John Cinnamus" states at the end that he wrote it in the year 1276. But the name Cinnamus is fictitious, and I doubt not that the forger has given a much earlier date than the true one. It is written on papyrus, such as the Orientals use at the present day.

Section 11 The Latin Benedictines were sent from Genoa to Constantinople and dedicated a Church there in the year 1395. What if about that time, or somewhat earlier in that century, those monks carried thither from the West the Greek books which I say were translated here in France, and with the altered Liturgies? An Inscription was there found, with the note of that year. Father Pierre Besnier of our Society (Jesuits) copied it at Constantinople, and showed it to me. Greek Rites which they had brought into use but a short time, say a decade, they forthwith call Apostolic Traditions. But the Greeks were deceived by the impostors, and accepted the Rites discrepant from the Latin, and not approved by the Apostolic See.

“Twenty years ago,” says Scaliger, ep. 157 (dated *Section 12* 13th May, 1602, p. 380), “Metetius Syriga, the protosyncellus of Silvester, patriarch of Alexandria, sent to the queen of Navarre a jewelled pyx with a Greek letter requesting her to send him copies of Basil, Chrysostom, Nazianzen, *which he could not acquire elsewhere.*” That was because they were actually conficted and written under the names of those alleged Fathers. None of those works are or were in the East, unless what had been carried thither from the West. None at all were certainly carried thither till the fourteenth century was far advanced. This is the cause why very few Greek writers have been turned into the Russian tongue. See in the apparatus of Possevin, p. 364, tom ii. To Ethiopia Greek books alone were carried, but very few of them and not before the sixteenth century. See Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. c. 4 n. 41, 42, and c. 6, n. 49.

The Greek writers, especially in their com- *Section 13* ments on Scripture, babble and prate more than the Latins. They knew that few would read, and that it did not much matter what they wrote, so long as they made up big volumes. “Gregory of Nyssa” in the whole of his first tome is a most verbose fellow.

In the alleged “sixth century” no new heresy is *Section 14* said to have been got up, and very few therefore of the writings of the “Greek Fathers” have been attributed to that age. Of these “Procopius” himself confesses that his work on Scripture had been compiled out of the works of earlier writers. After nine alleged centuries from the birth of Christ, the system

of the impious herd was finished and exhausted. Therefore they set down any works at all, whether Greek or Latin, to their "tenth century"; and they accordingly called it the Age of Ignorance, or the Dark Age.

Section 15 Of the alleged "Greek Fathers" why is there none set down to Greece proper, except Dionysius the Areopagite?—none to that learned land? Was it because the Attic speech is difficult, and therefore none dared to lyingly call himself an Attic? But the style of even the alleged Dionysius is not Attic. All the Greek writers use the same dialect, even those who are alleged to have written before the seat of the Empire was placed at Constantinople. In the French language we see the greatest changes in the course of 500 years. But in the Greek "Fathers" and historians there is not the slightest vestige of a change in the language during an alleged period of 1500 years! All use the same dialect and the same syntax. Balsamon is equally terse with Justin, Basil, Chrysostom. So in the Latins there is the like elegance and flow of language in Augustine, Bernard, Algar, etc.

Section 16 From the reading of these books the Greeks educated in the West, and especially at Rome, derive their errors, and defend them with the greatest obstinacy. If they knew them to be spurious, the offspring of a gang of scoundrels, they would lack weapons for resistance to the truth.

CHAPTER VIII.

The attacks of the monkish faction on the Popes. The fiction of the "Kingdom of Italy," and its object. The monkish Roman Empire is a mere fable, refuted by a mass of coins. The theory of Peter and his Successors. The fiction of the distribution of the Provinces among the Apostles. The dignity and power of the Pope is made to rest on Oral Tradition. The monks have endeavoured to overthrow his Primacy.

AMONG the other designs of the impious conclave, *Section 1* after they had declared war on God, was a violent effort to diminish the authority and power of the supreme Pontiff. They pretended that almost in every age some one of the Popes had erred in faith; in the third century they made out Marcellinus to be an idolater, in the fourth Liberius to be an Arian, in the fifth Zosimus to be a Pelagian, Hovmisdas to be an Arian in the sixth century, and Vigilius an Euty-chian; in the seventh Honorius to be a Monothelite. That is, in chief and capital doctrines about Christ those Popes were heretics; and, when a new heresy failed them that they could charge upon the Popes, they created in their "tenth century" prodigiously unchaste Popes!

Why did they invent the "kingdom of Italy?" *Section 2*
Why, that by placing kings in Italy, and emperors at Constantinople, the Bishop of that imperial City might contend for the Primacy with the Bishop of

Rome; and that there might be no Pope apart from the consent of the kings of Italy. See Anselm of Havelberg, in his third Book.

Section 3 Could any emperor have desired to force Councils to his will, as they pretended in their tales of Constantine and the two Theodosii, unless Roman History had been so made up as to show the emperor in the light of the supreme arbiter of the Roman empire; and that the Republic or Senate had no share of power, but were merely the servile flatterers of the Augusti. having lost their liberty? I say that such a form of Roman Empire is a mere fable; and that on the testimony of coins, more than 1500 in number, I have confuted it.

Section 4 All the Patriarchal Seats are feigned to have had heresiarch bishops, or certainly notable favourers of heresies; the Alexandrine Dioscorus, Petrus Mongus, etc., the Antiochene Paul of Samosata, Petrus Cnapeus, and others; the Roman Honorius and Liberius. They desired that not even the See of Peter anywhere should be thought free from error, or more so at Rome than elsewhere.

Section 5 They who hold the false "Fathers" to be true, and will have the Sacred Scripture understood by their unanimous consent; yet none the less bear themselves as strenuous defenders of the holy Apostolic See, and of the authority and infallibility of the Pope; they, I say, are hard pressed by their adversaries. For the latter very readily approve these words of Christ: *Thou art Peter, Feed my sheep, confirm thy brethren,* from the unanimous consent of those "Fathers" to mean that Christ does not give the supreme Pontiff

the supreme authority over Church and Council, or in defining controversies of faith, the highest power, and the infallibility of which they speak. So is Bellarmine keenly assailed by Launoy in his epistles, tome fifth.

The Calvinists and others who clearly saw that *Section 6* Peter never came to Rome used that argument against the Catholics—the *argumentum ad hominem*, as it is called. “You,” said the Calvinists, “have no Roman Pontiff as successor of Peter, unless Peter himself visited Rome.” But I utterly deny the first proposition. The Bishop of Rome is not the successor of Peter, but, as he is wont ever to subscribe in Bulls and Constitutions, *Bishop of the Catholic Church*. And therefore, as compared with the Pope, who is Bishop of the Catholic Church, the rest of the Bishops stand in the relation of Governors of provinces and cities to a king; and so, compared with the Royal or General Procurator, those who are called his Substitutes or Vicars.

In the same design they made up the tale of the *Section 7* allotment of the provinces among the Apostles, that it might be thought no more had been given to Peter than to each of the others; but that Rome fell by lot to him, Jerusalem to James, Ethiopia to Matthew, India to Thomas, and so with the rest. And that this might the more certainly hold with posterity, even in certain Martyrologies they consigned that feast of the Division of the Apostles to the 15th day of July among the Latins. *On that day the division of the Apostles for Preaching*. The Office of that day is for the same alleged event in the Breviary of Herbipolis (Würzburg).

Section 8 As Peter's care, after the death of Judas, was to have another elected in his place to be the twelfth, and to judge (as Christ had promised) after the descent of the Holy Spirit, the twelve tribes of Israel; so was it necessary on the decease of Peter that from the elders, that is, bishops and presbyters who were in Peter's company, another should be brought in to undertake and sustain the same duty, to confirm the brethren, to hold the keys, and in the universal Church to build up her powers, as Christ had promised. For to Peter alone the other Apostles are to be commended, to be confirmed by the Lord Christ. There will ever be in the Church both heresies, and Bishops who are to be confirmed in the faith. Therefore by some one who is equal in power to Peter this must be done; and also he must be an infallible judge of controversies; otherwise he could not confirm his brethren in the faith.

Section 9 The surest proof of a perpetual tradition and doctrine in the Church is the dignity and power of the Pope. For if books fail as they must—books framed with the object of bringing in atheism—it cannot afterwards be shown whence or at what time, except from Christ, it began to exist; nor could it be shown by any probable argument that the power of the supreme Pontiff in defining questions of faith was not ever the same that it is now. It is not clear that they had any temporal power before the tenth century; but that they had it at least from that age is clear from old coins.

Section 10 It was impossible, then, utterly to abrogate the primacy of the Pope, who was everywhere recognised

with perfect consent at the time that the impious gang took its rise. "Let it be conceded to him," they said; "but (1) only after it shall have been shown that in former ages of the Church the Greek and Latin 'Fathers,' and the Africans did not concede it; let us say that the concession was made by the Councils, not by Christ. (2) Let us pretend that there were a great many quarrels stirred up about that question, and that they have never been ended. (3) Let us change the supreme power into a Primacy, that is the first place among peers; let us give the second place in dignity and jurisdiction to the Bishop of Constantinople; let us constitute five Patriarchs, peers." Therefore they early, that is, from the fourth and fifth century, attributed like prerogatives to the Bishop of Constantinople, and much more in the ninth century; so that there might be in the last times an opponent of the Roman Pontiff. They added also a contention concerning the faith—namely, the procession of the Holy Spirit, because on matters of that kind dissidences are eternal; other controversies may be arranged on friendly terms. Thus they easily persuaded the Patriarchs of the East to withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of the Vicar of our Saviour Christ. This was effected by the spurious monuments written by the impious crew; which were either carried hence to the East, or were sedulously read in the Academies and Colleges of Italy by the Easterns, where literature was studied.

CHAPTER IX.

The Catholic Tradition alleged by Hardouin to be infallible; and Catholics to be independent of all Writings. He attacks the principle of Written Tradition as held by the Socinians and other heretics. Further defence of the alleged "living" and "unwritten" Tradition.

Section 1 **T**HE Catholic faith relies on the word of God alone, the written word (*scriptum*) in the canonical books, and the word handed down (*traditum*), as the Council of Trent defines. This tradition is not obnoxious to any error, because it is from God, teaching man what he would have believed concerning Himself and His institutes. That Tradition is, I say, much more infallible than that which holds that Louis XV., King of the French, is of a very noble and ancient stock. Even if there were no books to teach this, no other monuments, that tradition is infallible. So is the tradition among Catholics, not only on the other heads of the faith, but on the constant and perpetual succession of Pontiffs from Peter to Benedict XIII.

Section 2 We Catholics are like those noblemen, whose nobility is undoubted and confessed by all. We need not any writings for the proof of the antiquity of our faith; even as noblemen of primary rank seek not for tablets or parchments by which to support their nobility, as they do whose nobility is doubtful. The

heretics are like the latter; they seek witnesses or rather allies and patrons of their faith or infidelity; some quote the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," others quote others. But this is to rely on witnesses who may be supposititious. The Calvinist may be shown at some time that Augustine is supposititious. The Calvinists think they have shown the Anglicans that the epistles of Ignatius are supposititious, notwithstanding the current belief that they were received as genuine by the historical faith of 1500 years. Would not he who should prove Augustine to be spurious justly say to the Calvinists, "Your religion is vain," even as the Calvinists themselves say to the Anglicans, "Your episcopate is vain, for it relies on the false epistles of Ignatius alone."

It is said, "We should believe nothing that is not Section 3 written." How is this proved? Where is that written? If it is not written, it is not itself to be believed. If this is true, "*Only writing should be believed,*" it follows that *this* written thing being non-extant, it cannot be believed. From what time did the principle begin to be true? Who defined it, and by what power? The Apostles certainly taught the contrary; they said that the rule of faith was that which before they wrote anything, they taught by preaching. 1 Peter i. 15. *But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word which was preached in the Gospel to you.* He says not, *which was written*, but *which was preached in the Gospel*. I. John ii. 24. *What ye heard from the beginning* (he does not say *what was written and ye read*) *let it abide in you.*

They were writing to Christians; therefore they

were Christians not by means of written books, but of Apostolic Preaching. In fine, it is a folly to say that there is nothing certain in the faith, but what is written in Councils; since the alleged "old Councils," as we have them, are of doubtful credit; and there is nothing defined in the Councils, except because of the malice of heretics, who depart from Tradition; absolutely nothing which was not earlier matter of faith.

Section 4 The false "Irenæus" himself, who is believed to have written in the year 200, says: *But what if not even the Apostles had left Scriptures to us, ought we not to follow the order of Tradition, which they handed down to those to whom they committed the Churches? To this ordination many nations of barbarians assent, of whom they who believe on Christ without chart and ink, having their salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, and diligently keeping the old Tradition, etc.*

Section 5 Ps. xliii. 1. *O God we have heard with our ears; our fathers announced to us. They do not believe Scripture, because it is written, but because it relates what their fathers had told them. Ps. lxxvii. 3-6: What great things have we heard (not how great things do we read), and we have known them; and our fathers have told us. How great things he commanded our fathers, to make them known to their sons that the next generation might know; the sons who shall be born shall arise and shall tell them to their sons.*

Section 6 Exod. iii., 6: *I am the God of thy father; as if to say, If thou wouldst know me, learn from thy father, and desire no other witness.*

Deut. xxxii., 7: *Inquire of thy father, and he will* *Section 7*
tell thee; thy elders and they will declare to thee.
 It does not say, *Interrogate thy books.*

The Christian, Apostolic, and divine Tradition is *Section 8*
 contained in dogmas which the Church believed, until
 the rise of that band of wicked men. But the dogmas
 believed by the Church in those times are precisely
 those which the impious crew assails under the names
 of feigned Heresies. They would not have assailed
 them, if they did not understand that they were be-
 lieved in the Church, and were contrary to their own
 system of opinions. The doctrines attacked are all
 ours. In our system, therefore, the Apostolic
 Christian and divine Tradition is contained.

Were there no written Tradition, the faith which the *Section 9*
 Apostle praises would none the less be true, and most
 true—*faith from hearing*; he says not that it is *from*
reading.

If Tradition was not constantly preserved after the *Section 10*
 Apostles without writings, Mahomet would be more
 fortunate in his sect than Christ. The Sacraments in
 the Church are of Tradition, even as (if I may use the
 comparison) among the Turks circumcision is of tradi-
 tion; of which there is no mention in the Koran itself.
 But in the Church the tradition is confirmation of
 the truth; without the Church, of error. And
 assuredly, I ween, Mahomet would have desired to do
 away with circumcision, since he was an atheist;
 but against the use and tradition of his nation he
 dared not attempt it.

The impious and libertine would prefer nothing to *Section 11*
 the depression or neglect or even overthrow of the

force of Ecclesiastical traditions and the judgment of the Church which leans on that tradition. That unwritten tradition attests the Sacred Scripture itself, and by an infallible judgment; no alleged writing of the "ancients" is so attested.

Section 12 The Mosaic Law stood through more than 1500 years with the sacred books alone, and those for a long time very few, to wit, the Pentateuch alone, with Tradition and the Responses of the Pontiff in doubtful cases. Deut. xvii., 8-9: There were then no other books on religion and sacred matters. And why should not the Christian Religion stand, with its sacred books, tradition and Responses of the supreme Pontiff, seeing that the Church is in that respect like the Synagogue?

Section 13 The written tradition is the tradition of the Socinians, who utterly reject the oral tradition, or that which has all authority from the attesting Church; and yet they admit the written tradition down to the Nicene Council, because something of this sort is necessary to them, that they may prove their certain conviction, for example, that Matthew's Gospel is Matthew's. *There is a certain mean*, says Socinus, ep. iv. to Christopher Ostorod, *between Scriptures and Tradition. Nay, it is a manifold medium; Written Histories, and other testimonies and reasons which have lead and do lead men of sense to hold the Gospel of Matthew to be a true history of Jesus Christ, and not to hold it to be Thomas's work, there being here no intervention of the authority of the Church, and of the Spirit, by whom she is perpetually governed.*

Section 14 If there were no written tradition, yet that faith would be true which is believed to have existed con-

cerning the *homoousion* in the 318 Nicene Fathers, who are thought to have established it by their decree, though no book (or few) had that name or faith.

If Religion ought to stand by the testimony of *Section 15* written books, the essentials of Religion are gone. For the chief head of Religion, on which all the rest in their connection depend, is this: Who God is, of what nature He whom Christians worship, is. For all those books bring in another God than the God of Christians—I mean the alleged writings of the “Fathers”; they teach of a God who is simply such as atheists would have.

The living Tradition is by far the surer witness of *Section 16* the faith and of the true and ancient use in the Sacraments, than books, whether MSS. or published. In the Roman Ritual, before Paul V. and the year 1614, Baptism is placed under the triune mersion alone. Yet was that observed whether in France or Rome? It was utterly neglected, tradition and ancient use prevailing over the mischiefs of the impious band by whom that rite had been intruded. Certain Bishops, but by the favour of God, very few, would have Extreme Unction precede the Viaticum; and so formerly certain men placed it, even in Paris, because some old books and fictitious stories offered arguments for the usage. But who complied? That use was neglected, and rightly spurned by the faithful. The tradition was received from the Apostles’ lives. Nothing, then, written, is either true or useful, unless it consents with the perpetual Tradition of the Church.

It is indeed equivalent to a huge miracle that against *Section 17*

the gates of hell, against the efforts of the impious cohort, the force of the unwritten Tradition has hitherto been so wondrously exerted. For though that Faction poured out their venom into the Roman Missal and Breviary and Ritual; so that there is scarce any other book in which the dogmas of the Catholic faith are more subtly attacked than in those; nevertheless the faith stands sound and whole in the minds of the faithful and of Doctors dissentient from the contents of the Missal, Breviary, and Ritual, except the forms of the Sacraments; if you attend, in the case of the rest, to the words precisely as they sound, and not to the sense of the Church and of Catholics reading them. Lately there was published a Paris Ritual, showing a prayer in funeral services, such as are held in a Metropolitan Church; which openly teaches that souls enjoy glory only on the last day of Judgment. Are you therefore to say that this is the faith of the Church of Paris?

Section 18 They who in France and Lotharingia do not receive the Council of Trent are not therefore less Catholics in all that belongs to the dogmas of the faith. They embrace and hold them, not because they are defined by the Council of Trent, but because they have received them from ancient and Apostolic tradition, and by the Roman faith and institution.

Section 19 All heretics abhor Tradition as handed down, and apart from the written word; for if they granted that one was to be preserved, out of those which the Church teaches are to be received, all would be compelled to adopt and retain all those which she approves. A certain Calvinist asked me, where was the Tradition of the

dogmas which Catholics hold? I answered, that it was in the mouth of all Catholics, and accordingly certain and immutable; not in the books of writers, who may write what they will, but who cannot deceive the whole body of the Church. So the Tradition of the sense of Calvin perseveres in the mouth and the minds of the whole Calvinist folk; and therefore it is certain and will not be changed, even if all the books should perish, in which anything is written in the sense of Calvin.

God makes light of written tradition or sets it at *Section 20* naught, as He has shown in these last ages. For since the monuments are all false on which commonly Catholic Doctors rely—nor merely false, but adverse to the faith; none of the Doctors relies on them, unless he can effect, by means of twisted and forced interpretations, by some violence or art, a consent with the non-written tradition; that is, with the judgment of the Holy Roman Church, and the consent of the Catholic world.

But the one and the other tradition is necessary; *Section 21* otherwise how could one part show itself the superior in the interpretation of the Sacred Letters? For that reason the Socinians claim the Fathers of the first three centuries. But if they vainly do this, because I am proving these writings to be supposititious—there remains the one unwritten, *vivâ voce* Tradition; that, namely, of the Bishops who lived when the impious crew forged these writings, and those who now live, and are of the same mind with theirs.

The best tradition is the unwritten; for it is not an *Section 22* impossibility that the writings in our hands are sup-

posititious, or (if you will) that they have been corrupted and depraved. On the other hand the living tradition is ever incorrupt, and constantly the same. It is impossible that that faith should not be held by all in the Church this year, which was her faith last year, or ten years ago; and thus our fathers were assured of the faith of their own and of a former age.

Section 23 The unwritten Tradition alone is openly favoured by Deity, and it alone protects the faith of the Church from injury. However the false Augustine and the false Fulgentius and other books written with great artifice, and by all received with honour and reverence, may state that the efficacy of Grace is irresistible; yet the Church has laid down, and hands down, that which she received from the Lord. Let theologians explain Augustine and others as they will; she will meantime, when enquired of, reply from her invariable tradition: he who shall say that there is never resistance to interior grace in the state of lapsed nature, let him be anathema.

Section 24 If these monuments, which with God's help we shall show to be false and supposititious, are the offspring of the fourteenth century, it is manifest that religion stood for thirteen centuries apart from written tradition safe and inviolate, such as now the Roman Church and with her the Catholic world holds and professes. Christians through 1300 years either wrote no books, or only pious books, which were worn out and so easily perished; even as the Jews through 1500 years were content with their sacred books alone and tradition.

Section 25 It is an evident proof that living Tradition, not that which is written in the monuments believed to be of

the "Fathers," or in any others, is the rule of faith, as I have just pointed out that the Catholics always understand those writings according to that Tradition; and if perchance the writings should seem contrary to the Tradition, forthwith Catholics may exclaim that they are apocryphal or corrupt, or should be softened by a kindly interpretation. The Sacred Scripture itself teaches the necessity and power of Tradition; the Tradition of the Sacred Scripture itself shows the truth. The Catholic Doctors who desire to show that the mock "Fathers" were of Catholic mind, what else have they in view but the strenuous defence of the non-written Tradition, which they received from their elders? Therefore it is preferable to the written, is older and more fixed in men's minds, and more venerable.

If in written tradition alone the Christian Religion *Section 26* is contained, let no one place his hope in Christ's merits, in the merits and satisfactions of the passion of Christ, but in Christ only, that is, in the example of his Resurrection, the like of which God or Nature bids us hope for. For not one of the "Fathers" has said that our hope is to be placed in Christ's merits; neither in epistles nor tractates, nor in discourses to the people, nor in disputations, nowhere in fact does that dictum occur, not once on the part of any of them. The hiding of so great a matter, what is it but a denial of it? Forsooth, if God is simply Nature, there can be no place for merits. But assuredly reason and religion and unwritten tradition teach another doctrine.

An uncertain Writer (not of our Society of Jesus, *Section 27*

I am sure, nay, one hardly fair to it) thus excellently reasons in his French Letters written to a friend on the disputes of Jansenism, p. 7: "In rigour the Church has no need of the testimony of Antiquity to establish the truth, and consequently the perpetuity of her belief. Her own testimony suffices her; for that, the principle of S. Irenæus having no less point in reference to the written tradition than for the sacred books, which he did not think necessary to her. Even if, said he, the Apostles had not left scriptures, ought we not to follow the order of Tradition? And so, though all the ecclesiastical authors and all the Councils should be lost, or though they should never have existed, we should have always to abide equally attached to the oral and living tradition of the Church, and to believe that she never changes anything in it, however distant she may be from its origin. She will have in all times the right to say to her children what St. Chrysostom said to his people: The things that I teach you are of tradition; ask no other proof of them. It is not by writing that the Church has received her faith; no more then is it by writing that she is obliged to transmit it."

Section 28 Again, p. 6: "It would have first to be proved that the Church of each age resided essentially in the authors who remain to us; or at least to show that they were inspired. For if it is allowed that they were only private persons, however holy and enlightened they may be supposed to have been, they might possibly have erroneous sentiments on fundamental points of Religion."

Section 29 And on p. 67: "Assuredly to found the truth of the

Church's decisions on the intelligence of Authors who cannot rigorously be said to represent the Church of their time, is not to do a good service to the Church. Tell me, can four or five Theologians per century be regarded as so many Œcumenical Councils?"

Some one may say: Perhaps this faith which now *Section 30* flourishes was introduced little by little, even as there were introduced into the daily Office, into the Missal, into the Ritual very many prayers alien from the true faith, as is patent from the success of the Calvinist innovation in France. On the other hand ecclesiastical prayers can be readily taken up, when they delight by their beauty and are believed to have nothing on first appearance that is adverse to the faith.

The Lord's Prayer in Latin seems to have been *Section 31* accepted from Tradition, before the Gospel was written. For where we say "*daily*" (*quotidianum*) Matthew wrote "*supersubstantial*."

CHAPTER X.

The alleged twofold "Word of God." What books are approved. Hardouin obstinately denies that sacred Letters are imperilled by his criticism: because a good Catholic will shed his blood in their defence. The Councils are fictions. The Roman Catholic the only true Church. The Calvinists have no certainty. It is pretended that the Catholic faith flourished in Bishops, Monks, and Clerks who wrote nothing. The literary monks alone were Atheists.

Section 1 **I**F you repudiate all the old writings, some one may say, you lay down that the one rule of faith is the Word of God. Yes! but, as the Council of Trent says, the Word of God is twofold; one written in sacred books, the other handed down by the mouth of the Church and by hand. But the written word of God I say is to be understood in the sense that the Pastors have learned from the Roman Church. It behoved that they should be sheep before they became shepherds; disciples and sons of the Church before they became Masters and Fathers in the Church.

Section 2 I do not detract from the authority of all written books; I do not forbid books of tradition to be adduced as testimony. But what books? Those that were at once approved by all good men, which saw the light of publicity at once; books which Fathers, that is, Catholic Bishops, weighed and commended; not books that were furtively edited, that were hidden in book-cases and libraries, were brought out thence much

later, and were put forward by men self-deceived in their ignorance, or impelled by their impiety to overthrow the Christian Religion by these weapons; books, in fine, scarce ever read and considered in their integrity as they ought to have been; I deny that these are fit witnesses of tradition, or that they are to be held in any esteem.

It may be said that I shake the whole foundations of *Section 3* our belief. But this would be the saying of injustice and ignorance. I do indeed reject "historic facts"; but the Catholic faith and the universal received discipline I show to stand on the written and traditional word of God, so that both have been perpetual, never even impugned in public, before the fourteenth century, and not even then, except by atheists.

Another may say that the words of "Vincent of *Section 4* Lerins," c. xxi., are applicable to me:—

"You may hear some of them say, Come, O ye foolish and wretched, and learn the true faith, which none but ourselves understand, which was hidden for many ages, but was lately revealed and shown; but learn furtively and secretly, for it will delight you. And when ye shall have learned, teach it in secret, that the world may not hear, that the Church may not know. For to few has it been granted to receive the secret of so great a mystery."

My reply is, God forbid that I should teach a faith hidden for many ages. I preach and expound that very faith which the Catholic Church everywhere held. I was compelled in the first instance to point out privately, to pious and erudite men, those by whom it was attacked; because in this matter the minds of the

ignorant must be prudently handled. They are numerous, they must not be exasperated, lest they should overwhelm us by their numbers.

Section 5 You may urge that, if all the alleged writings of the "Fathers" are supposititious, the Sacred Letters themselves are imperilled. Not in the least, I reply; for you who make this objection, being a Catholic, would shed your blood in defence of your confession that the Gospel of Matthew, for example, or the epistles of Paul, had Matthew or Paul for author. But for asserting that some book bearing the name of "Augustine, bishop of Hippo," and called Augustine, you would not endure three stripes in public. So by Catholics will sacred letters be ever championed, and the more as other books come into contempt.

Section 6 You may say, "Then all books must be burned." Nay verily! you should diligently preserve them; there is the greatest use to be derived from them; they teach how the faith attacked by these writers flourished down to their time, in all its capital points—that is, our own most holy faith. But secondly, what if they were burned? If God were to reveal that they are all spurious, as I teach and believe, you would also believe this; nor would you deem that Religion or tradition lost anything thereby. Tell me then, will Religion more suffer, if by studious labour a fraud inimical to her be detected, than if it should be laid open by revelation? What matters it, the way in which the truth is known? Can truth hurt truth?

However, I say that you should keep and preserve with the greatest care the books of Augustine and all the rest, though they are supposititious. For they are

highly useful for the thorough knowledge of Religion, provided you diligently look into the sentiments of the writer, and yourself hold the contrary of what he teaches.

You may say: "Then you deny and reject the Council of Nicaea, of Ephesus, and the like." God forbid, I reply, that I should wish to rescind the faith which Catholics believe to be established by these Councils; I would with all my heart that it were held by each, even unto blood; but I do deny that that faith is contained in these Acts, if they are rightly understood; I hold them to be feigned and got up for the purpose of overthrowing the true and Catholic faith. *Section 7*

Another objector may say: "You favour the Puritans, of whom Spondanus (after others) discourses, against the year 1565, no. xxii., 'who rejected all the ancient Fathers to a man, not enduring that they should be alleged, even for the confirmation of their own opinions.' " *Section 8*

I answer: "Add the following sentence: 'For they said that the Church was from the first corrupt, from the very times of the Apostles; that they might not be forced to admit some traditions;' and you will understand that the difference between them and myself is no less than the difference between the worst heretics and good Catholics by the gift of God."

You may say: "If the writings of the Fathers are spurious, we shall have to stand on Scripture alone, as the Calvinists insist." I reply (1) by denying the consequence. The true consequence will be that we must deem that to be the only true holy Society or true Church under heaven, which with the sacred books *Section 9*

worships the true God. But the Catholic or Roman Church alone worships the true God; she therefore alone must be held the true Church. The minor proposition is most certain. For the Lutheran and Calvinist sect leans on the principle of the impious faction; that there is no God but Nature and the light of Nature, which they call Right Reason and Truth, the sum of all eternal truths. The God of the Socinians is the Father. Therefore the Society of the Roman faith is the sole true Church.

All these things are proved from their books and decrees, which best agree with Atheism; that is, which may stand and be defended, though no true God were acknowledged. But if one of them should nevertheless acknowledge the true God, and be content with Scripture alone, let him strike out a new hypothesis, a new Church, falsely so called. Moreover, he cannot be certain of his own system. For how can he know for certain, unless he has learned from revelation, that nothing else is to be believed or done but that which is contained in the sacred books? But a revelation of that kind cannot be, since the revelation made to the Church is adverse to it.

Section 10 And so I reply (2) even if we had to stand on Sacred Scripture alone, each man ought to be certain of the genuine sense of Scripture. But the Calvinist cannot be certain that the sense which he ascribes to Scripture is genuine, that is, the sense held by the ancient Church. For if all other monuments are false, except the Scripture—as I contend, and know that I have in great part proved—by what arguments will he teach, that the sense which he feigns in Scripture was

the sense of the ancient Church? But if that sense which he feigns to find in Scripture is the very same in those monuments which Atheists framed in the design of undermining the Roman faith if possible; if this is surely made out, it will be in like manner certain that the sense which the Calvinist feigns in Scripture came from atheism, and is simply the sense of Atheists; and that the only genuine sense of Scripture is that opposed by the atheists, and defended by the Church.

You may say: "It follows that, in those ages in *Section 11* which you place your Forgers, all Monks and Ecclesiastics were atheists and impious!" I answer, Nay! the impious were solely the literary craftsmen whom I repudiate; and how few they were, compared with the rest, the multitude of the faithful! Meantime the Catholic faith flourished in the holy Apostolic See, in Bishops, Monks, Clerics, who wrote nothing; in many also, under whose names spurious works have been placed; and finally, in the whole mass of Christian people. They assuredly were Catholic Bishops and Doctors, from whom the Catholic tradition has flowed down to us. Otherwise, when, prithee, or by whom did they receive a faith diverse from that which is contained in those fictitious fourteenth century books? By whose exhortation or impulse?

Some one may say, "Would that you had been pre-*Section 12* sent at the Congregation *de Auxiliis*; you would have proclaimed the victory of Molina, by showing that his adversary relied on the authority of one atheist in particular, that is, of one false Augustine. How useful a service would one have rendered, who with like

opinions to yours had been present at the Council of Trent!" I answer, "It behoved not that this should take place; God willed himself alone to make His cause—fiercely attacked by heretics, feebly defended by Catholics who tried to make writings opposed to them serve their purpose—depart victorious. This He brought about, so that no man might have whereof to boast concerning the victory gained by God or the Church. Better instruments indeed than puny fighters, like myself, God needs not, who often chooses the weak things of the world to confound the mighty."

CHAPTER XI.

The corruption of the Liturgy; of the Breviary and Missal. The distinction of Receiving and Reciting something in the Church. In what sense are there "no errors in the Canon of the Mass?"

THE fraud appears to have first begun with the *Section 1* Ecclesiastical Office, after the Bible had been completed and the Greek version had been conficted. Divine worship being neglected in many places, the impious band introduced under show of reformation the forms of Ecclesiastical Office and of the Sacred Liturgy itself which now obtains—except the Lections from the writings of the "Fathers," which had not yet been conficted when they composed the Mozarabic Breviary so called. It is wanting in those Lections; it has lections from Scripture only. And so by song, by hymns, by the Ecclesiastical Office, the whole virus was first insinuated into the Church. Some good things were then admitted by the Church, as the Gregorian chant, so called, I imagine, from Gregory IX., and rites or ceremonies which conduce to the majesty of religion. But in the prayers, on the other hand, were inserted matters at the same time, tending to establish their heresies and dogmatic consequences of their impiety. Their wickedness also invaded the Ritual books, in which they entered the trine immersion, as I said, and it remained there till the times of Paul V.

Section 2 While the Pontiff was at Avignon, they induced certain Churches of the City to receive the Psalter corrupted by themselves, under the name of Jerome; and it holds its ground there even now in the Vatican Church. So they hoped they should remove the authority of the Vulgate Edition. But far other is the faith of the Roman Church, which God ever guards with peculiar care; than some rites which He suffers now and again to be brought in, though not in themselves to be approved, until by his authority they are emended or altogether done away with. The Apostolic See suffered before the later thirteenth century each Church to sing praises to God as it willed, and to celebrate the Mass itself in the same way, knowing that all were agreed in the faith. There was no need then of a Congregation of Rites, as there was later, or of a manifold reformation of the Breviary.

Section 3 It harms not the integrity of the faith, that those enemies of the true deity have inserted many falsehoods into the book of Daily Prayers, or into the prayers of the Liturgy itself—falsehoods that we daily recite in their integrity. It is not what we sing, but what we believe, that makes us faithful as Christian men; and they may recite them with faith intact—a faith that ever holds on the same within the heart—and they ought to do so, none the less who are held by this obligation to recite; until the holy Apostolic See shall have reformed them—or any Church whatever, that has the right to do so.

Section 4 Anything that in the Roman Breviary is read other than out of the Sacred Books is by mere permission of the Roman Church—as the fictitious Council of

Clovesho, of the year 747, would have believed—or rather, it is mere tolerance; and from that tolerance it may depart, when it wills. And oh that this were speedily its will! The Jansenists know that the Roman Missal itself profits their cause, that is, their impiety; it is they that have turned it, with other old works that favour their impiety, into French.

But if in the Church certain prayers might be in- *Section 5*
cautiously admitted which are of a sense quite contrary to the tenets which the Church defends; seeing that those prayers are in themselves brief, and very often recited, and are daily in the mouth of all, and are easily recognised for what they are; who can wonder that huge volumes, which most men, especially Bishops, Canons, Parish Priests, Religious and others never read, and Doctors themselves do in some measure but lightly examine—should have been taken up not by the Church, but rather in the Church, as if they were the genuine offspring of the Fathers whose names they bear? For few, as I have said, read them, still fewer understand them, and the Church never called for an examination of them.

There is a great difference between something being *Section 6*
received by the Church, and something being *recited* by the Church. That is recited in the Church which private Doctors, appointed to this business by the Bishops—if they be Catholic—think may be piously understood, and has no occult venom in it. In this matter they may be deceived, they may not note the fraud introduced by others. But on the other hand, nothing is *received* by the Church, as the column of truth, but that which pertains to the faith, both

written and handed down. Would you clearly know the difference in the two cases? If not only the supreme Pontiff, but any bishop whatever, who has the right in his own diocese to arrange the form of Breviary and Missal at will; I say, if anyone of that place and rank should expunge and delete from his Missal, Breviary, or Ritual anything that is there of Greek or Italic version, or excerpted from the writings of the alleged "Fathers," he will be at liberty to do without offence to any. But, on the other hand, should the Pope himself, with the whole College of Cardinals, will to erase a single verse from the Sacred Bible of the Vulgate edition, what clamours loud and piercing would be raised against this innovation! Who would not protest? The authority of the Sacred Books in the Church, and her reverence for them is quite other than that which belongs to any other monuments whatever.

Section 7 The impious artificers of those prayers persuaded the Romans—in the absence, in my opinion, of the Pope—as they had earlier persuaded the French at the time when each Bishop was at liberty to appoint the form of Breviary and Missal in his own diocese, to adopt that rite which had the show of piety and age. They also feigned a Greek and old Italic translation of the sacred books, which they might insert into ecclesiastical books; because it was impossible to introduce those corruptions into the Vulgate Bible itself. For, in good sooth, by what art could that Bible be snatched out of the hands of all Christians in the whole world, that it might be adulterated? They could not have tried so insane a device. They were

displeased, for example, that the reading in the Psalm (95, 10) was *Forty years I was offended with this generation*; because their Nature or Natural Light, which they hold to be God, is angry with none. Not being able to change that in the Sacred Bible, they thus corrected it in the Breviary: *Forty years I was very near to this generation*. And who, so far, protests?

The query is made, How was it possible that the Section 8
Bishops everywhere received this form of Breviary and Missal, and that none were sensible of the fraud? I answer in the first place, that it should seem none the less, very much more strange, now that the world is educated, that none suspects the virus that is to me manifestly contained in these books; that none is zealous enough to complain nor (should he be a bishop) to emend the wrong. I answer, secondly, that the impostors did in times of yore what some of the Franciscans did with the object of bringing in the feast of Stigmata of St. Francis. I show this to be manifest from the collation alone of the lections of the Breviary, which were in the Office under Paul V., with those which are now to be found in it. I say, the early artificers of false monuments lied when they declared they were not innovators, and that old usages were alone to be revered and restored; that their neglect could not be too grievously bewailed. They brought forward alleged old Missals and books of daily prayers of their own concoction; Canons of Councils, by which it is laid down that there should be one order of Singing and prayer in Masses, and in the offices of matins and vespers. Little by little

reverence for a false antiquity caused the whole world religiously to adopt things that I see to be contrary to the Catholic faith in the Liturgies and Prayers; though nevertheless the true faith, as the Bishops well know, remains in the minds of the Catholics. In the Congregations of Cardinals, in the Bishops there is the power to alter what is evil, when they shall observe that what has been written with evil mind has been evilly understood.

Section 9 You will say: "The Council of Trent, Session xxii. cap. 4 and canon 6, affirms that there are no errors in the Canon of the Mass. I answer that the Sacred Synod speaks against heretics, who said that some errors were there contained respecting the faith or the universal discipline. Of that kind is the doctrine of the transubstantiation of bread into the Body of Christ, through the words of Christ, of the adoration of him *sub speciebus latentis*, of the oblation of the sacrifice and its fruit for non-communicants and for the dead; of the intercession of Saints, by which we there seek to be assisted; of the words of consecration to be pronounced in a low voice, and other like points. In this kind the Canon of the Mass is certainly so pure from all error, that in cap. IV. it is said, "nothing is contained in it, which is not in the highest degree redolent of a sanctity and piety, etc." But, on the other hand, if the question is of the words themselves, if any one shall say that some things seem to have been fraudulently suggested by impious men, but were adopted by the Church without thought, and by the permission of God, the faith being meantime intact; I do not think that such a man can be held to

suspect such errors in the Canon of the Mass as those which the Council of Trent denies to exist. Errors are contained not in words, but in evil opinions.

In like manner, if the question be of certain names *Section 10* of Saints, since it pertains alone to the errors with which the holy synod deals, if any should deny that the Saints are to be invoked as in the Canon of the Mass; any Catholic who believes that the Saints are there to be invoked and himself religiously invokes them, using those very prayers, which are there read—yet who thinks that certain names of Saints have crept in (as it is allowed that into the Martyrology some have certainly been inserted)—and that these are fictitious. I say he is not to be thought an adversary of the synod, especially if the names be attributed to those to whom the feigned histories attribute them, as the names of Linus and Cletus.

CHAPTER XII.

The Apostolic See will not have the alleged writings of the "Fathers" held as sacred. These writings are the source of all the heresies. Hardouin attempts to explain away the Decree of the Council of Trent on the Fathers, and on the alleged second Nicene Council, &c.

Section 1 **T**HE Apostolic See has so far been unwilling, is still unwilling, and will ever be unwilling that the alleged writings of the "Fathers" should be held as sacred writings, that is, of the place and rank of the sacred books, although this was the purpose of those who first took care that these monuments should be read in the Breviary at the same time with the Sacred Scripture; and who placed in the matins out of nine lections six which had been taken out of the writings of their so-called "Fathers."

Section 2 Unless all these monuments be discredited, the foment of the heresies will be perpetual in the Church. For the Calvinists and Lutherans and Jansenists find all their impious ravings in them. And so great is the force of the arguments which those foes of the Church and of religion seize upon from that source, that (1) Catholics can produce none in like manner, with good faith for the truth and cause of God from the same source; (2) no other reply can be made to the objections, except by saying that far other is, and has been, the tradition of the universal Church;

and this can hardly be proved by any written testimony above about 200 years, or at least before the rise of Printing, assuming that the monuments written before this time to be genuine. But if on the other hand it be admitted that they are spurious as in fact they are, our Tradition will then have the authority of long ago; for it will be of 1700 years, and concerning God it will be found to have descended from Adam and Moses.

It has not escaped me, that the holy synod of Trent, *Section 3* session v., professes that it "follows," besides the rule "of the Sacred Scriptures," the testimonies of holy Fathers and most approved Councils, and the judgment and consent of the Church herself. But the Council thus spoke of Fathers and Councils because it perceived that these were equally admitted by adversaries and by Catholic doctors as authentic, that is, as having proceeded from those writers whose names they bore. Wherefore the Council praises these as not questioned in common opinion; having meantime decreed to transfer nothing from those writings into its own, except what it knew was held by Catholics to be most approved, because received by them according to the same sense of the Catholic Church. For no one surely is ignorant that—I do not say all former Councils and all alleged writings of the "Fathers"—but that not one lucubration of a single ancient writer was called to critical examination by the holy synod or by any of the Popes, that it might be decreed whether it was truly the work of the author named in the title. Wherefore in matters of that kind which are of mere fact, of which the synod speaks according

to the received opinion of its age, it is incorrect to say that the Church pronounced judgment. The valid principle with just judges is that expressed by Melchior Canus, *lib. v. de locis Theologicis, c. v.*, on the authority of Councils, "Matters that in the decrees of Councils or Pontiffs are brought in for the sake of explanation or—even by the way and in passing, beyond the chief institute on which controversy was mainly held; these do not pertain to faith, that is, are not judgments of the Catholic faith."

Section 4 Tillemont tom xi., p. 391, says:—"There are homilies cited under the name of St. Chrysostom by Councils of Antiquity; because the Councils have been wont to make use of what is found received in their times, without staying to examine if the pieces are truly of the authorship attributed to them." He took this observation from the notes of Fronto Ducaeus on Chrysostom, tom. vi.

Section 5 No more did Rome approve the other Acts of Councils of the ancients, as we now have them, more than she approved the Acts of the sixth Synod. It is clear that this synod was never approved by the Apostolic See from the fact that she expunged the name of Pope Honorius from the Roman Breviary, 28th July, in the office of St. Leo, where it had been intruded by the impious crew from the false Anastasius—as if the name had been noted with an anathema in that synod. The See is therefore of opinion that in the Acts of that synod, in like manner, that name should not be inserted among the names of heretics; that the Acts are therefore corrupt; the See did not approve them. Rome ought to be believed to have approved only

those Acts of Councils which the Papal Bull confirmed—as the Canons and Chapters of the Council of Trent.

If the definitions of the Councils rest on the testi- *Section 6*
monies of the Fathers, they are not free from suspicion or risk of error; for they rely on testimony obnoxious to censure. For say: by what revelation is it established—revelation which alone is infallible—or by what tradition on a parity with that by which the Church holds that Peter's or Paul's Epistles are Peter's or Paul's—that this or that book is Augustine's or Ambrose's? Who knows not that certain things in certain Councils—which are writings of heretics—are found attributed to Fathers? On no such testimony did the Church will that her definitions in the Council of Trent should lean; nor in the constitutions of the Popes which are undoubted and genuine.

In the Council of Trent the force is far greater of *Section 7*
the Canons than of the Chapters, in which the doctrine of the Canons is explained; even as the authority of the Gospel is far greater than of even those Commentaries which holy Fathers are commonly believed to have put forth. In the Canons the Holy Spirit dictates all opinions. In the Chapters some mere facts may creep in, which the synod itself does not adduce as certain and undoubted, if it has not examined them; it only recites them as commonly received, as neither in any wise injurious to the faith or otherwise. Of such kind is the reference to the Novatians, to the second Nicene Council, etc.

You will say: "Under Clement VIII. the Patriarch *Section 8*

of Alexandria was received on condition that he should anathematize Dioscorus; therefore the Roman Church adopted the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Again, in the year 1441 the concord of the Jacobites in Egypt with the Holy Roman Church under Eugenius IV. holds the same opinion of it and of all other heretics; and commemorates all the old Councils."

I answer (1) That this concord of the Jacobites with the Holy Roman Church under Eugenius IV. rightly is viewed as a forgery, since on an old silver coin in my possession there is mention only of "united Armenian Greeks in the Florentine synod with the holy Apostolic See, under Pope Eugenius IV." Depicted on the reverse are the Byzantine Despot and the Armenian Patriarch, with both knees bent, looking up at the Pope who is depicted above. I answer (2) that under Clement VIII. the Roman Church then chiefly willed that the faith of the Chalcedon Council should be received, believing it to be that held in the West; she followed Doctors on that question of fact who were about 400 years ago led into errors by the authors of those spurious Acts; but in the doctrine of faith she followed her own tradition alone, so interpreting the symbol of Chalcedon itself.

Section 9

The Council of Trent, session xxv., on Images, when it says: "That which has been sanctioned by the decrees of Councils, especially of the Second Nicene synod against the assailants of images"; does not define either that there *was* a second Nicene synod, or if there were any, what its sense was; but only what Catholics believed its mind was, and the Roman

Church herself according to the opinion of Catholic Doctors thought, if in truth that synod did exist. For it was not expressly examined, whether there were any such synod. The same principle does not hold in respect to the sense of Jansenius, for example, for the book was allowed to be of Jansenius, and Catholics and Jansenists were agreed on the sense of the author; and so the Church expressly pronounced on that sense, not on *what* it was, but of what *quality* it was. His *fine opinions* were condemned as heretical. Again, the phrase "*that which*" in the decree of Trent signifies only that the words from the second Nicene synod were received; but the Fathers of Trent will that that sense should be held, which upon that matter Tradition and the Apostolic See, the mistress of Tradition, teaches all Catholics, and which the Calvinists and the rest of the Protestants disapprove.

In the Council of Trent, session III., *on the Symbol* *Section 10*
of Faith, it is said, "The Confession of Faith must be put in the first place, the synod having followed in this the examples of the Fathers, who in the *more consecrated Councils* were wont to place this shield against all heresies." But when I say that the sense is: they follow the example of those who are commonly believed to be Fathers, and of Councils whose Acts are commonly thought to be peculiarly consecrated. Not the mere verbal sense, but that which the Church understands beneath the words, is that which the Fathers of Trent certainly desire it to be believed they assume, along with the Apostolic See.

Never has the Church pronounced juridically *Section 11*
 the genuine sense, whether of those Acts or of any

book out of the "Fathers" commonly so called; it is clear that neither was ever called into examination by the Apostolic See. The synod or the Pope only says in general terms, that the sense of the holy Fathers is Catholic. That is most true; otherwise they would be neither Fathers nor saints. No propositions were taken out of the books of the false Augustine, which it declared to be good and true in the sense of the author; it accepted only some words, which it proposed to all, not as Augustine's, or in the sense of the man who first wrote them, but as here and there amended, and to be understood in its own sense.

Section 12 But the objection is made: "The Calvinists themselves acknowledge the Lateran Council under Innocent III. and the Canon *Omnis utriusque sexus* (everyone of either sex)." Quite so! But they do this because it behoves them to assign the time at which, as they will have it, the necessity of Confession was brought in; or to admit—as is the fact—that no beginning of that institute can be assigned, but from the Lord Christ. On that account they have chosen the Canon, because they have no stronger weapon against us. But I say that in point of fact that Canon was first drawn up by the impious crew of forgers; it does not allege that Confession is necessary by divine law, as it is, nor that the power of the priests for the conferring of grace is *ex opere operato* (from the work wrought). It looks upon the priest as a medical man. But if, as I contend, that Canon is a fiction, though later praised by the Popes, it is vain for heretics to assign it as the beginning of the necessity of confessing sins, brought into the Church; and no beginning

can be assigned by them. And thus also the cause of the Church is victorious.

The Council of Trent praises the Canon, *Every one* **Section 13** *of either sex*; but does so on the received opinion of the Doctors, and makes what is laudable in it for its own; what is defective in the Canon and yet is of highest importance in that matter, the Council most wisely and from Tradition supplies.

CHAPTER XIII.

Further attempt to explain away the Decrees of the Council of Trent. The true Fathers and the false. The Chinese theologians compared to the Heretics. Further discussion of the meaning of the Decrees of the Council of Trent: what is meant by the "common consent of the Fathers?" Further attack upon Augustine and Thomas Aquinas as spurious writers.

Section 1

THE Council of Trent decrees, session iv., that the Sacred Scripture is not to be interpreted *against the unanimous consent of the Fathers.* To this objection I answer (1) the Council says it decrees this, *in order to coerce petulant minds, which would interpret the Scripture in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, contrary to that sense which our holy Mother Church held and holds, whose part it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, or even against the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*

It follows that on any point in which there was not a unanimous consent of all, one may depart from them; if one does not therefore depart from the faith and doctrine of the Church. And if there be even unanimous consent, but against that sense which our holy Mother Church held and holds, they will justly cease to be deemed Fathers; and it will behove us to believe that the most holy synod either spoke of others,

that is, of Catholic Bishops, who died in the communion of the Apostolic See; or, that with Catholic Doctors the synod took it for granted that the unanimous consent of those false "Fathers" was not adverse to the sense of the Church and the Apostolic See. Which assumption had they tested and examined they would have detected as false.

In no other question is the consent of the Fathers— *Section 2* that is, of those commonly so called—more unanimous than in the demonstration of the existence and nature of God; for it is the same in all of them. But then their proofs are plainly *atheistic*; nor in that matter alone, but the whole of their Theology, their doctrine of the Trinity, of Christ, and the consequences of these capital points of the faith, are atheistic. Therefore the Holy Spirit must be said to have meant something else, when he suffered the unanimous consent of the Fathers to be commended. Certainly the sense in the mind of the Holy Spirit was that in which the sons of the holy Roman Church acknowledged those writings ought to be understood, which were commonly believed to be of the Fathers. For "Instead of thy fathers, children were born to thee"; instead of true Fathers, children were born taught by them, that they may retain and defend the true sense of Fathers truly so named.

Father Lombard says of the rites of the Chinese, *Section 3* p. 18, "When we told them that Xangti was the Creator of the universe *in the manner that we conceive, they laughed*, and turned us into ridicule, being well assured, that according to the principles of their sect, Xangti is Heaven, or the virtue and power of

Heaven; and that consequently he cannot have been before Heaven, but only when Heaven or after Heaven existed. If we would push the dispute further, and prove in our way that the Architect is before the house he builds, they interrupted and cut us short, saying: *Well, since your God is our Xangti, you have no need to explain to us the matter, because we know better than you what Xangti is.* In fine, whatever effort we made to show them that their interpreters have not given a good explanation of the word Xangti, they ever replied, that we did not understand their books."

Now change the names; put for Chinese—Jansenius, Andreas Martinus, or Ambrosius Victor, Thomassin, Malebranche, and other Augustinians; for Xangti put the Truth of all eternal truths in every kind, which those theologians hold to be God; there is a complete parallel. First they laugh at us when they hear our profession that the God of our worship is the object of worship to Augustine and other Fathers. Then they interrupt and say: "If God whom you worship is the God of Augustine and the rest of the Fathers (for on that matter their consent is wondrously unanimous) it is well; we need not your exposition, for we know much better than you who is the God of Augustine and the rest." They openly boast they know better than Catholics the nature of Augustinian grace, and they think that Augustine makes for them; and great progress, forsooth, do they make in propagating that grace of the false Augustine. Unless God help us—owing to our ignorance or sloth, the God of the false Augustine and the whole impious band will make the same progress.

If the synod of Trent defined that the writings of *Section 4* the Fathers contained the Tradition of the Church—down to what times did it define the age of the Fathers? To the times of Bernard, as usual? Why should it reject other bishops who wrote later? Was the Church at this day to reject St. Francis Sales? If saints alone were to be admitted, why not all of them? Why after Bernard is no Father allowed, after Thomas and Bonaventura no Doctor of the Church? For more than five hundred and fifty years have elapsed since Bernard, and from Thomas and Bonaventura four hundred and fifty. What reason is there except that it was not and is not the usage of the Catholic Church to employ the appellation Fathers or Doctors of the Church; it was the device of the impious crew, and of the men whom they deceived. All those false Fathers were got up and forged in one workshop in the fourteenth and the fifteenth century. Afterwards, no such fabrications of “Fathers” were known.

The Council of Trent then hands down infallible *Section 5* rules, in which the truth and integrity of the faith is contained; and declares them to be sacred books, and traditions conserved in the Catholic Church. It could not hand down rules, except those by no means obnoxious to error; of which kind are the two I have mentioned. But the lucubrations of the “Fathers” are not infallible rules. The Council could not therefore give those writings or the writers themselves as an infallible rule for the distinguishing of the truth. And certainly the Council did not so give them. It could not affirm that the writings attributed to the

Fathers contain the certain and infallible testimony of the received Tradition, before it weighed them one by one; before it surely separated the genuine from the spurious, and then decreed that there was nothing in any of them at variance with the true tradition. It did neither; hitherto the Church has willed to do neither.

Section 6 Wisely and truly the response was made from the City to the province of the Lower Rhine, 9th December, 1594, in these words: "The Pontiff, being asked to command that none should be admitted at Salamanca to the degree or chair of Theology unless he subscribed to the doctrine of St. Thomas, answers that he will not and cannot do this."

Section 7 You will say: "The Council of Trent, session vi., chapter II., seems to approve the writings of the Fathers, when it says: None should use that rash saying, prohibited by the Fathers under anathema; that the precepts of God are impossible to a justified man to observe. For God does not commend impossible things, etc." I answer, when the Holy Spirit judged that the time was not yet come for the detection of the mystery of iniquity, he suffered the most holy synod to use these words, which it was then, as matters were, necessary and useful to employ; at a time, I mean, when the writings alleged to be of the Fathers were admitted to be such by those against whom the synod was framing its decrees. The language cited was in a manner an argument *ad hominem* on the part of the Holy Spirit: "You, heretics, think these writings to be of the Fathers; but then their teaching is contrary to you, etc." And again, the holy synod

praises the sense and words of the Fathers, not as they are to be found in the books; for it had not discussed these either as a whole, or any one of them by particular examination; but such as they were believed to be by Catholic Doctors; nor others could the synod of Trent approve. The error was in the fact, not in the decision of fact, but in the supposition; the synod assumed as admitted, that the sense of the books was that which Catholic Doctors reported.

“But nevertheless,” you will say, “the Council of *Section 8* Trent praises and commends in the interpretation of the sacred letters the consensus of the Fathers, session iv.” I answer that the Synod of Trent only decrees, as I have already said, “that no one relying on his own wisdom, in matters of faith and morals—twisting the sacred scripture to his own meanings, against that sense which holy Mother Church held and holds, or even against the unanimous consent of the Fathers, dares to interpret the sacred scripture itself.” But as for me, I do not rely on my own wisdom, I rely on the sole faith of the Apostolic See, I do not twist the scripture to my own sense, but I interpret by the sense and decrees of the Church; I do not prefer the unanimous consent of any body of men whatever to the sense of the Church; I acknowledge no Fathers, save those whom after particular examination she has acknowledged; which examination it is allowed she has not yet instituted.

Nor does the synod of Trent, nor do the Popes in *Section 9* their *Brevia* commend the common consent of the holy Fathers or the doctrine of Augustine or Thomas, except hypothetically; that is, if it should be admitted

that the books adduced under their name are truly theirs, and contain doctrine by no means contrary to the faith of the holy Roman Church, who is mother and mistress of the Fathers themselves. This is patent from the fact that she suffers and thinks it right for everyone to call all and sundry works of that kind to examination; which no œcumenical synod, no popes, could permit in the case of the books of sacred scripture. But they in whose writings, after that examination were found opinions contrary to the Catholic faith, are certainly condemned by the Church, and repelled from the society of her authorities.

Section 10 Who then will be the Fathers, whose consent is praised by the Council of Trent? I answer, all Bishops and Doctors who have departed in the communion of the Apostolic See. Of these, together with the Apostles and Prophets, we understand that saying, *The God of our Fathers*. How is their unanimous consent acknowledged? From the faith and doctrine of their successors, adhering in like manner to the Apostolic See. But we must lay it down that there is still in the Church the gift of the Holy Spirit for the understanding of the Scriptures. The passage therefore of sacred letters which the Catholic Doctors unanimously apply for the fixing of a dogma—to this it behoves that there should have been the unanimous consent of those who were truly Fathers and Doctors. From this place, for example, *Whose sins ye shall remit*, etc., they collect the power of the priesthood in the remission of sins; these are Fathers; nor were there other Fathers in days of old, except their like in that manner. From the passage “By the word of the

Lord were the Heavens established, and by the breath of his mouth all their virtue," most of the ancients gather that there are two or three persons in God; but they are not Fathers; none believes their unanimous consent in this matter. All with unanimous and marvellous consent interpret scripture allegorically, though some more sparingly; who does not at the present day thoroughly spurn this way of interpretation, except the Jansenist faction, in the Bible named of De Sacy?

Let any that wills laugh at me when I say that the *Section 11* Popes and the Synod of Trent, when they praise all the Fathers, or mention Augustine or Thomas by name, meant this, that they follow the doctrine of the holy men, who are recognised and worshipped in the Church under these names; and not that doctrine contained in spurious writings, if there are such, falsely circulated under their names. He who ridicules me for saying this, or for asserting that so either the Fathers of Trent prophesied, or the Vicars of Christ, since they were each in his own way Pontiffs of the Church of God; let him also ridicule John the Evangelist, who says of Caiaphas, that he prophesied because he was high-priest of that year, although the malevolence of the man shows us that Caiaphas had another view than that hinted by the prophetic sense of his words.

Therefore the Synod of Trent may seem to have *Section 12* spoken with a certain prophetic spirit, when it praised the common consent of the Fathers. It did not mean our extant writings, for they are not in common consent except in impiety; but, since they whose falsely-

entitled writings are extant, do not consent with the Church; the synod willed to praise the consent of *those* Fathers, and to pronounce them to be truly such, whose doctrine together with their sanctity of life the Roman Church extolled, that is, all Bishops and Doctors, whose names it entered in the Album of Saints. For these in very truth ever did consent with one another and with the Church.

Section 13 I say then, when the Popes commend in their *Brevia* the doctrine of Augustine or Thomas, they say these two things only: (1) That holy men could not commit anything to writing except according to the Catholic faith; (2) either that sense is to be found in the books which bear their names on the title-page which the Catholic Doctors think to be in their words; or, books of that kind must be entirely condemned. For of a holy man and a Catholic Doctor the doctrine cannot be other, nor can the Roman Pontiffs approve any other in any writer than that which agrees with the constitutions of the Popes. They say not, that by their command these things were written and diligently examined, and that according to the sense intended by the author they were Catholic. Wherefore if anyone shows that they are not Catholic, provided he earnestly defends the sense held by the Roman Church, the sense which she believes to be acknowledged by Catholic Doctors in these writings; he is above all a Catholic, and he obeys the dicta of the Popes with the reverence desired by the Popes themselves.

Section 14 The Catholic Doctors who think the books attributed to Augustine genuine contend with all their might that Catholic doctrine is contained in them.

They are believed by the Popes, though the matter is not otherwise discussed, and though no Doctors lay this down from any power delegated to them by the Apostolic See. And so the error of fact is found in both, prior to any examination either accurate or juridical such as ought to precede Apostolic definitions. The error of fact is, if anyone will have it so, in the Popes themselves; but it is not the error of fact ill defined; but error of fact along with Catholic Doctors, and because of them, incautiously supposed to be the truth.

But—it will be objected—there are extracts from *Section 15* Augustine and Thomas and others, read in the Roman Breviary. Here I answer in the words of Antonius Gallonius, priest of the Oratorian Congregation in Rome, in his Apology for Cardinal Baronius against Constantine Bellotti, of the Order of St. Benedict, published in Rome, in the Vatican Printing Office, 1604, p. 10:—

“You say that *Lectio*ns have been accepted from John the Deacon, and that they have been introduced into the Roman Breviary, and you argue from that, that we are no longer at liberty to call the writings of the said John into controversy. But I reply that the Roman Church does not hand down the Breviary itself to be so recited—except the *Lectio*ns taken from the *Canonical Scriptures*—so that she should will in all matters in it to obtain the place and rank of Canonical Scriptures. For if it were so, why did Pope Pius V. expose it to correction, when some matters in it were correct? Why very lately under Pope Clement VIII. was the same principle handed down as to be

H

recognised, many places having been emended? Among other matters, the assertion which John the Deacon makes of the Cardinalate of Gregory under Pope Benedict, is corrected; so that the name of Benedict was removed, because learned men felt that it was an *open and manifest lie*." How much more justly should be expunged from all Breviaries all Lections alleged to be from the Fathers, when impiety has been detected in the same?

Section 16 Alexander VII., in his *Brief* dated 7th August, 1660, praises the "unshaken and most safe dogmas of the Church in the Doctors Augustine and Thomas," and their "great names"; but to them he prefers "the sane and incorrupt doctrine, such as so many declarations of the Apostolic See and traditions of the holy Fathers require."

Section 17 In the Brief which Innocent XII. wrote, 6th February, 1694, he says, "Augustine, who was of knowledge so great, that he was held to be one of the best masters by our predecessors; and his doctrine according to their statutes is followed and preserved by the Roman Church." The Pope here speaks according to the common opinion of Theologians, but that is false; for the very Epistles of Celestine and Hormisdas which the Pope here has in view are spurious, the forgeries of the impious crew who fabricated Augustine himself.

Section 18 Pope Clement XI., 28th January, 1704, in his condemnation of the book, *True Tradition*, etc., by M. de Launoy, says that it seemed to the Cardinal Inquisitors, "as impious, blasphemous, and injurious to the most splendid light of the Catholic Church, and to

the great Doctor St. Augustine, nay to the very Church and to the Apostolic See." And again: "Desiring firmly to follow in the steps of the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, who had ever great esteem for the lofty doctrines of the same holy Doctor, and embraced it with all their hearts," he "condemns and reproves" the book, and "forbids it to be kept, under pain of excommunication for the deed."

But I answer (1) that the book is truly called impious and blasphemous, which accuses of impious doctrine and novelty a man believed by the writer to be a saint, and enrolled among the saints by the Church. I answer (2) that it is truly said to be injurious to the Church and to the Apostolic See; both because it supposes the assertor of impious dogma (as I have said) to have been by her enrolled among the saints; and also because it asserts, cap. viii., that Pope Celestine favoured the false dogma; or that at least he willed neither to condemn nor to approve the evil doctrine of St. Augustine; whence that doctrine becomes problematical. I answer (3) that the saying about the "lofty doctrine, etc.," can have no other sense but this: the Popes and the Apostolic See have esteemed that doctrine because they think, and truly, that it is wrong to assume that any impious doctrine exists in the books of one they have pronounced a saint.

Wrong doubtless and blasphemous it would be to think this of St. Francis Sales, or of St. Charles Borromeo; whose writings the whole world learned to be genuine during their lifetime. But it is not so certainly made out that the works bearing the names of Augustine and Thomas and the like are their genuine

productions. The Catholic Doctors now benignly interpret them, lest holy men should be thought to have been masters of heresy and impiety; but not yet has the Apostolic See, nor have the Catholic Doctors themselves weighed them; and they still think that it is right for anyone to inquire diligently into this matter. And if some sagacious and laborious Catholic Doctor should detect that these books were falsely placed under the name of a great Doctor and Saint, by the impious crew, the Apostolic See will be first to declare that the mind and opinion of the Popes was none other than that which I say it was. Certainly, whatever the Apostolic See shall say it has examined, and then approved or condemned, I hold must be approved or condemned by all Catholics. Who thinks otherwise, him I consider a heretic and condemned by God. But the See has never examined the writings attributed to Augustine, to ascertain whether they are his or not; never has the See said that she has commanded them to be examined. Until this is done, she cannot speak of them otherwise than all Catholic Doctors—the matter not being weighed—from common and popular fame alone; no sense of these books being meantime approved than that which Catholic Doctors approve, and which the See itself proposes by her Constitutions to be held. At present the Apostolic See can only speak as she does. For it would be hurtful to Catholic Christianity to confess that he, who is believed to be an incomparable Doctor by the Catholic Church herself, has been the standard bearer of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Jansenists, that is, of all the Atheists. Meantime the doctrine comprised in the

books attributed to Augustine is in fact condemned by the Apostolic See—above all, by the latest Constitution of Clement XI., *Unigenitus*; all the Jansenists agree with very many Catholics, and certainly with myself, that this is so. The Jansenists daily cry out loudly about this matter, they demand that Augustine's doctrine shall be left intact. And none can deny that the sense of the false Augustine is as clearly seen as that of Jansenius, but the illiterate, or the contentious, and the lovers of eternal strife.

You will say: "You after the lapse of 1700 years *Section 19* say that all the alleged old Greek and Latin writings on Ecclesiastical matters are spurious; this never before occurred to anyone during that vast period!" I answer, that judgment could not be passed on these works before they came into existence and could be read; now they were forged in the fourteenth century, but they could scarce be read until they were printed, and this was mostly done in the sixteenth century. Almost immediately after they had been conficted, Wyclif and his party abused them; afterwards Luther and Calvin. Catholics had more at heart to defend their non-written Tradition in every way, which cannot be mistaken, than to read writings of dubious credit—a matter full of toil and tedium. Moreover, they had not enough leisure to separate the spurious from the sincere; or rather to understand that they were all fabricated with a view to introduce and establish impiety.

No kind of argument seems to me more miserable *Section 20* or more imbecile than that adduced in attack upon our faith from the testimony of writings which began to

be brought out of bookcases of Libraries late in the fourteenth century. Tell me, suppose that I, for example, and ten associates, or forty if you will, should in this age conspire—I at Paris, others elsewhere—to treat the same subject-matter on some new principle, would anyone justly infer from this that a hundred years or more hence, all the Parisians, the Romans, the men of Bordeaux, of Toulouse, of Lyons—Spaniards, Italians, Germans—and the whole world shared our ravings, and abandoned the prejudices instilled into them? Especially when it is manifest that writings of that kind, so soon as they were forged, were hidden with great care in Libraries, not to be brought forth until the lapse of a certain time; and that they were not marked or held for sincere, except on the testimony of those who were implicated in the same folly and affected by the like madness.

CHAPTER XIV.

The design of the Forgers in writing Ecclesiastical History. Fictitious Popes in "Augustine." The Church History of the First Twelve Centuries is entirely fabulous. It is allegorical and dramatic in principle. It is the result of Collaboration. Their perverse Greek and Roman History. Men could write any lies with impunity, there being no public Registers, no criticism, no contradiction. Forgeries on leaden plates, &c. The fabricators of Church History wrote also Greek and Roman History with a view to avoid suspicion. It is maintained that modern Latinists can write equally well with most of the alleged "classical" writers. The consent of the monkish historians with one another proves conspiracy: and their variations are designed, that conspiracy may not be detected.

TO prop up the fraud on all sides, it was necessary *Section 1* that Ecclesiastical History should be early written. For so they would prove by diverse events that the faith and discipline which they desired to introduce and have observed had existed in all ages. On this account, with the view of framing History, and gaining credit for it, it was necessary besides, to make out the series of Roman Pontiffs; that it might stand fast in what age, and about what year, each had lived; of whom out of the Patriarchs, each was the contemporary. So Augustine in Epistle *CLXV.*, in describing the series of Roman Pontiffs, invites our confidence (if we believe him) in the whole Church History down to his own times and to that very series

of Popes, because he knew that it was necessary to gain belief in both for the purpose of establishing his hypothesis. But I assert that all the names of Roman Pontiffs which he adduces are forged. Of Linus, for example, there is certainly no record extant at Rome; that is, there is no church of his name, no chapel, no trace of his cult. This is not the place to speak of the others one by one. I do not say that the series of Roman Pontiffs was not perpetual and uninterrupted; Heaven forbid! I say only, that it was not more written down as a whole, was not and is not more necessary to be known, than the series of Jewish High Priests was written down in its integrity in the sacred books, or in the archives of particular cities of the Christian world, the series of bishops. It was not more necessary to be known than that series of the Jewish Pontiffs was, or is now, necessary to be known.

Section 2 I shudder to say that there is no more fabulous History than is that called Ecclesiastical History of the twelve past Ages ("500-1700 A.D."). I speak not of the Lives of the Saints; here the matter is manifest; I embrace in the phrase all the other historic writing. If this is true, and it is true, who can wonder that tractates on matters relating to religion are forged, since they rely on false and forged historical narration? Nothing can be pronounced more holy and divine than the Catholic Religion, if you consider its dogmas; nothing more sordid, if you consider either the writings of the false "Fathers," or the historical narrations (except the Sacred Books). Verily, an *enemy hath sowed tares among the wheat!*

Section 3 The Histories are so many allegorical narrations;

so contrived that the professed worshippers of Truth instead of God might not seem to write mere lies. They are so many dramas or tragedies, artistically woven. If you take but one chapter away, it is to remove the *destina*; the building must come to the ground. They all agree in the purpose of setting up atheism, equally with the books called dogmatic.

The pestiferous gang joined forces in the writing of *Section 4* History; hence they very often copy one another, and they overwhelmed readers with the number of books, and so made it harder to believe that the suspicion of fraud and falsehood was well founded. Scarce is there anything more like another, than are the writers on Heresies among themselves, though one sometimes seems to go farther than another, or to illustrate the matter more fully. They are in number about Twenty. Many more are the writers of Chronicles, and they frequently copy one another. Spondanus says against the year 1215, no. VII., on the Lateran Council: "The Chronicles of this period called Urspergensis, Altissiodorensis, Stadensis, and Parisius nearly all use the same words; so that they seem to have drawn from the same source what they have written on these matters." More truly he might have said, All these writers came from one impious workshop.

If there is no God, as the impious crew would have *Section 5* you believe, but the Nature of things, and the natural light, which is Right Reason; and there is no other Christian Religion than obedience to Right Reason, which may be called Philosophy, since Right Reason is also Truth and Wisdom; it follows that all those who obey Right Reason and natural light are

Christians. Therefore very many pagans were Christian, although without God, as Paul affirms. For this reason the forgers found it expedient to write Greek and Roman History, full of the vices of Princes and People, full of homicides, slaughter, impurities of every kind, their object being to prevent readers from supposing them to have been Christians. They must therefore be represented as *not* having lived under the guidance of reason.

Section 6 Why are there fables in the books of pagans, which bear some likeness to sacred histories? Because, if there is no God but Nature, and events have taken place in any part of the earth, to teach man, and have therefore been consigned to letters, which are called Sacred Books, it behoves, said these atheists, that in other lands and nations similar effects of Nature should happen, which in like manner should be committed to writing. Therefore it behoved them to show that elsewhere histories of events had been written, among Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, with the object of in like manner instructing men.

Section 7 With the view to concoct Roman and Greek History, they took many names of men from ancient coins of which they had a great store; it is through their hands that they have come down to us. Whatever names are not extant on the coins or in Pliny, they have forged from the Hebrew, as I show in particular instances. That there was no Roman or Greek History such as we have, earlier in existence, is manifest from this evidence; that this history is in violent conflict with the old coins—in relation to Genealogy, Chronology, and the deeds of Princes; as I have shown from

the coins of the Augusti, from Caesar to Heraclius, and others. The coins are absolutely silent on the matters we read of in the written history; nay, they exhibit the exact contrary; what stronger evidence can there be of the fabulous character of the histories? Hardly anything that is engraved on the coins is represented in the written history; is not that another proof of its spuriousness? What wonder that they lied in profane history, when they perverted or adulterated sacred history?

Had we no Annals written of the deeds of our *Section 8* Kings in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, beyond some mere index containing the names of the kings written out in order, and obscure rumours of wars; what a rich fund this might seem to some rogue, out of which he might contrive a history, or rather a fable of those times! He might make out civil wars in different provinces or foreign wars with the English, Dutch, Germans, Italians, and Spaniards; and again, alliances and treaties of peace. And such a fund the nefarious conspiracy thought they possessed; a space of twelve hundred years after Christ was exhibited, and more, in which our ancestors preferred to live a holy life rather than to write learned annals.

Unless published books were extant, and Public *Section 9* Registers, how could we know who was bishop of Paris one hundred and fifty or two hundred years ago? But there were no public Registers in France before the late thirteenth century.

If anyone wished to make up a history not only of *Section 10* primitive times, but of the present kingdom of Morocco and Fez, or Algiers, which are regions placed

opposite the shore of Europe, with what impunity he might lie! If in like manner it came into anyone's head to make up a history of the Persians, and to show that there or in the kingdoms of Africa just named, Morocco, or Fez that the Christian Religion had greatly flourished, that churches with monasteries had been built, that Councils had been held, that persecutions had now and again sprung up; to call particular kings, Christian and Mahometan, by their names; he might write any fables he chose, and go unpunished. That was much easier in the fourteenth century than in our time, when fables are hated. Now such is the whole history of the African Church, as we now read it.

Section 11 They concocted nearly all the history of past time so that it might agree with their impious hypothesis. But that which above all they endeavoured to overthrow and subvert stood whole and unhurt in the minds of the faithful; I mean the worship of the true Deity, and of the true God and man, Christ. So far the Lord judged his own cause. Let men think as they would of Greek, Roman, French, Spanish, English matters; or even of historic narrations of Ecclesiastical affairs; God cares not what idle (Blank in translator's copy.) Meantime he signally protected His cause, and will protect it, according to its piety.

Section 12 Not on parchment only, but on leaden plates the forgers wrote certain things relating to Ecclesiastical and profane history; and others have more recently imitated them. Thus Ahmed ben Cassem al Andalousi, a Moor of Granada, who lived in the year 1599,

cites an Arabic MS. of St. Caecilius, archbishop of Granada, which had been found with *sixteen leaden plates*, inscribed with the Arabic character, in a cave near Granada; on the attestation of Don Pedro De Castro y Quinonas, Archbishop of Granada. These leaden plates, called Granada plates, were afterwards taken to Rome, where after several years' examination, they were at length condemned as apocryphal, under Alexander VII. The book *On the Infancy of the Saviour* contained many fabulous matters, on which see D'Herbelot. Of the same kind are many leaden plates which have been cast into tombs, to give pretended testimony to the deposit of the bodies of Saints there. Or they have names of Princes or of Consuls inscribed, with a view to invite confidence in the Fasti. On a false leaden plate, as the false "Guibert de Novigento" tells us, was written, FIRMINUS MARTYR AMBIANORUM EPISCOPUS; see his Book I., and on the pledges of the saints, chap. iv.

On stones also they engraved various frauds, false *Section 13* inscriptions, like fictions of Consuls, the canon of Hippolytus, and other matters.

If Church writers alone were produced, forthwith *Section 14* fraud would have been suspected, since nought of the profane writers seemed to have been preserved with the same care; and there was the other reason above given for the forgery of profane writings of older times. Therefore they had to frame the Greek and Roman History as we have it. They must also write poems of all kinds, which might serve to prop up their impious hypothesis, and in which the genius of the nefarious conspiracy might be apparent to the more

sagacious of readers. The Church writers must seem to have drawn from these books what they told of the histories, fables and religion of the Ethnics; they must not seem to be inserting any of this out of their own heads.

Section 15 Even as in our time the Jansenists write elegant French vernacular, they who are the heirs of that older impiety; so in the fourteenth century the men who wrote the best Latin made Cicero for us, the *Æneid* of Virgil, Lactantius, and all the rest who are famous for their superior elegance in writing. But under other and great names they desired their lucubrations to appear, since this was to their interest, just as it is to the interest of the Jansenists to hide themselves, and not to inscribe their names on the books they have composed, for fear of the authorities. Pleasing and elegant minds they were—as Spondanus says—who on the occasion of the quarrel between the Pope and the Emperor Frederic, composed alleged prophecies against the year 1239 (nn. vi and vii).

Section 16 They put the names of others to lucubrations, not their own, and why? That they might acquire more authority from the name of a distinguished man, specially a bishop or a saint; and that all the ages might be filled with many witnesses of their Atheism. Were not in our own age two great volumes published under the name of Father Lemos? Why did not the craftsman cause them to appear under his own name? It is the like reason in both cases.

Section 17 But, men raise the objection, “From the *Æneid* the real author would have acquired for himself immortal fame.” But I reply that the *Æneid*, and the writings

under the names of Tully or of Plutarch and others, were got up by men more intent upon the propagation of their impiety than of their fame. And so there is not one of these works that does not everywhere smack of the impious faction; not one certainly which does not seem, if it be believed from its title, to be old, and to invite a like belief in the age of others by whom it is praised.

If there were inscribed on smoky parchments *Section 18* the treatises on Rhetoric, Tragedies, Orations, Poems, Odes, Panegyrics, Tractates on physical matters, Epistles, Epigrams, and other Scholastic Exercises which have been written in this one college of Paris during thirty or forty years; why, we should have new Quintilians, Senecas, younger Plinys, Virgils, Statii, Lucans, Horaces, writers of Odes—and perhaps better!

But now the reason and the art and the will is wanting for deception; which in those times were in full force. The *Constantinus* of our Mambrun is not unequal to the *Æneid*; the Odes of Sarbievius are superior to the Horatian in my opinion; and the *Sedecias* of Malapertus outshines Seneca the tragedian.

Wonderful is the consent among the historical *Section 19* writers—which proves the existence of the pestiferous conspiracy—even when they are thought to be in the greatest dissent from one another. They purposely affected the appearance of dissent, that the suspicion of conspiracy might be avoided. The principle of agreement is, that they are almost all allegorical or enigmatic histories, in which places and times and names the most unlike have the same occult and alle-

gorical signification. Hence you may understand how much useless writing there is in this our age, directed to the harmonising of these writers one with another, and to the discovery of the truth of old history by any sort of conciliation of their diverse narrations.

Section 20 Missionaries from Persia have reported to us, that Persian histories of the wars of the Romans against the Persians in no way agree with our Annals. Nevertheless, we do not think the Persians to be more truthful than our spurious writers. For as to the events before the time of Mahomet contained in the historic books of the Arabs, they are mere fables and dreams; as those skilled in Arabic agree with me in asserting.

CHAPTER XV.

It is maintained that there were no truly Catholic books before the invention of Printing: that there were no Libraries before the fourteenth century, and that they contained none but forged books, excepting the Bible and prayer books. All the monastic books have been ante-dated. Bernard of Clairvaux made last of the Fathers, at least 200 years after his decease. The fables of MSS. brought from east to west. The period during which the Greek and Latin writers were forged: the Revival of Letters. Some haunts of the Benedictine forgers pointed out. Further exposure of the system of Fraud.

WERE there then no books before the fourteenth *Section 1*
century? Yes, there were many, for of writing books there is no end; but such as we now have in great numbers, which the larger Libraries alone keep, and only a few then; which no one could or would preserve, unless by the benefit of Printing they had been easy to prepare, and of no dense volume; books of a kind which are spurned by the better Libraries and cast out; I refer to the Royal and Colbertine Libraries, and the like.

How comes it to pass that before the invention of Printing not a solitary book is extant which is in even one dogma Catholic; and that in the Libraries care was taken to preserve and lay up only books which had been written by some one of the impious crew? Other books might circulate among the public, and little by little be worn out and perish. If Catholic

books were laid up in the Libraries, they would be so many witnesses against the productions of this impious gang. With great care therefore they had to be eliminated, and to be kept out. Before the institution of Libraries—and there were none before the fourteenth century, all consisting of no other books than those which were then forged—with the exception of the Bible and books of prayer which might easily be carried and worn by use, but might daily be restored. Just so the Jews kept nothing written but the Bible, which could be carried in one hand or in a wallet; so did the Christians, until the rise of the impious cohort.

Section 2 No books appear to have been written until years after the age lyingly assigned to them by these forgers—many years, now more, now less; so that they could falsely pretend that the writers were just of the opinion that they pretended them to be. While the writers were living they could not have pretended this. And therefore no history has been written by a contemporary writer; but long after his death it has been attributed to a contemporary writer; that is, some hundred years later. Of the more recent history, that of the Council of Florence was put forth about thirty years after the Council was held.

Section 3 That at the beginning of the fourteenth century the design was adopted of contriving the writings of the “Fathers,” should be manifest, as I said, from this, that the Forgers determined that Bernard of Clairvaux should be the last or most recent of the “Fathers.” This they could not do until at least two hundred years after his decease. Then they could persuade the world that their writings had been found

to be his. They were bound to will and to do this: (1) lest after their time some other should in like manner be thought to be Fathers, who yet might dissent from them, that is, orthodox and Catholic men; (2) that they might show that down to the time of their "Fathers," all Doctors had been of their mind, and that it was wrong to depart from them. But it was not the custom of the Church to call any writers Fathers; if it had held this custom it would still retain it. But it does not retain it. And in this particular the craftsmen had a splendid success. From that time it was believed (1) that the last Father was Bernard; as if there could not be afterwards learned men to beget sons for Christ through the Gospel; (2) that it was a sin to depart from the doctrine contained in their writings even by a nail's breadth.

Who can wonder that in the turbulent times of *Section 4* Philip the Fair, and perhaps a little before, but much more after his death, there were men of genius, but atheists; who, in accord with the principles of their impious hypothesis (in which there is indeed much of acumen, no less than impiety) wrote books which they hid in Libraries like bastards in the obscurest shades of the places of their birth; designing after a few years to persuade men that they had been brought from Greece, from Africa, from Egypt, under St. Louis, from Italy, and other parts of the world; even from France itself, and from other places than where the writers really lived? Who, I say, can think that incredible who has seen with me, in the times of the most religious prince, Louis the Great—a time in which

there is said to be and is a large number of learned men, and who certainly would wish to be held Catholics—that nevertheless books are not only secretly written, and in no small number; but that very many are openly printed which manifestly teach Atheism, in this Christian kingdom, this leading city, few taking note of it, none protesting?

Section 5 The time seemed opportune to the impostors for fabricating false monuments when some could be said to have been brought into Italy and France from the East, whether after the taking of Constantinople by the French in 1203, or after the re-capture by the Greeks (as the Oriental historians indeed write) in the year of the Hegira 655 or year of Christ 1257; others from Egypt, Syria, Africa, after the expeditions of St. Louis into those regions. Hence it seems to have come about that into Spain few ancient codices came; into lesser Britain scarce any.

Section 6 Down to the rise of Printing there was great facility for forgery, and great lust for it. After its rise it may have been more difficult. And so the great period for forgery was the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries; the period of Printing, the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries; the period of examination and detection of fraud, the end of the seventeenth century and the following ages; so that the fraud may not acquire strength with years. And I think it to have been a singular providence, that God put this thought into the mind of none—I mean to hold all “Antiquity,” as they call it, suspect of falsehood—before the whole had come out of the Library shelves. For some monuments are of great service

for the understanding and testing of others. But now we can hardly expect anything of any moment, in addition to the material which has become public property. Therefore it is now the time, as it was not before, to show all men clearly how pernicious they are to the Catholic Religion.

The Greek writings alleged to be of the thirteenth, *Section 7* fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries seem to have been forged from about the year 1450, at Venice, whence they were carried into Germany. So it comes to pass that a large number of MS. copies are there still, in the Bavarian, the Augustan Library, etc.; and they long were in the Palatine Library. Very many are at Venice, Milan, etc.

The Latin writings were earlier produced than the *Section 8* Greek; hence the Latins of early ages hardly praise any Greeks, or only a few, added later at the end of a work. So it is that some cite some canons, others others of the Council of Nicæa, which they had determined upon; and these canons were omitted by the later framers of Nicene canons.

The impious coterie had mathematical computers of *Section 9* eclipses, lawyers who framed Codices and Laws, medical men who wrote on medicine, poets who put forth their songs, linguists and interpreters in their service, who turned their Latin writings chiefly into Greek, also into Hebrew and Arabic; even as the Wittemberg theologians had a Greekling who translated the Augsburg confession to be sent to Jeremias of Constantinople, in a somewhat lax and loose style, though of quite the same sense. They who then kept schools also gave their assistance; they wrote volumes on

Grammar, Rhetoric, Dialectic, Music, under the names of Augustine, Cassiodorus, Rabanus Maurus, and others, all of which lucubrations are assigned to monks.

Section 10 About the year 1350, Maximus Planudes is set down as having lived, who turned fifteen books of Augustine on the Trinity into Greek; that is, not many years after they were finished. See what Spondanus says, no. vi., on the advent of Manuel Chrysoloras into Italy, 1397:—"He soon began to teach Greek letters, which had been silent in Italy through the badness of the times for near seven hundred years; first at Venice and then at Florence and Rome, and at last at Ticino—and so excited the minds of the Italians, that not only did they happily take up that language, but also restored to its ancient splendour the Latin, which had contracted much barbarism from long time.

Section 11 Pavia (Ticinum) or a man of Pavia, seems to me to have much to do with the wicked faction (1) because they pretend that the body of St. Augustine was there; (2) because they made up a tale of distinguished prerogatives attributed to its bishops by the Popes; and with good success, for they preserve them to this day, though they rest only on those false monuments. See tom. i. of Ughelli's *Italia Sacra*. In Belgic Gaul, near Theodosius' Villa, I suspect that some of these works were concocted, from what I find in "Paulus Diaconus," book i., chap. v.; but many more in France, and above all in Paris; the English and others then imitated the French.

Section 12 There were then in the West many fugitives from the East, skilled in Oriental languages, to whom books

written in French and Latin were handed over, to be turned into Greek or other foreign tongue. So, lately in this city have we seen a man who turned into Ethiopic from the Greek the homily of Chrysostom on the Natal day of Christ. If this should be carried to Ethiopia, presently the translation will be held as of the same age as Chrysostom himself. The same judgment must be passed on Greek MSS. and others. For these reasons they pretended that in the year 1285 the study of Arabic and other Oriental tongues was instituted at Paris, as Spondanus relates against that year, n. xxii. The statement is false; but it is a true belief that long afterwards were translated from the primary Latin sources into Arabic the history of Elmacin, the Annals of Eutychius, the Arabic version of the Bible, etc.

Father Pierre Besnier, of our Society of Jesus, told *Section 13* me that there was shown to him at Constantinople a treatise on the Primacy of the Pope, written in Greek, under the name of Arsenius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, whose successor Dositheus was then living. But Besnier detected that the treatise had first been written in Latin; and then had been translated into Greek at the request of three Residents who were most ill-affected towards the Roman Curia. The style did not in the least smack of a man born under a Greek sky.

From about the year 1350 to the year 1480 seem to *Section 14* have been forged all our writings and writers attributed to the eleventh and following centuries, down to that year 1480, and chiefly the Decretal books of the Popes, the Extravagants, etc. That this space of

time might be filled by the authors, questions were renewed—of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and of the primacy of the Pope, which had been very often agitated before. The Scholastic *Summae* were also got up, to be received in the schools as the writings and opinions of the “Fathers.” Two Councils were then forged on the Procession of the Holy Spirit; the second one imperfect, that of Lyons, so that afterwards another one was demanded by Barlaam, which was better attended, because Patriarchs were present; and which was held in the following age in the year 1439.

Section 15 Charters, diplomas, false privileges began to be forged under Philip the Fair, more under Philip of Valois, most under Charles V., king of the French, as I have elsewhere shown; some things also on Egyptian papyrus, brought into Europe after the Egyptian expedition of St. Louis.

Section 16 In the examination or censure of particular works I can point out numberless arguments, incidentally offered, which prove the age to be that which I assign. Works under the name of Augustine ceased not to be forged in the late fourteenth century; witness the Sermons to the brethren in the desert, which learned men agree were then conficted by some French Fleming.

Section 17 “How,” you will say, “was it that the world was not astounded, that so great a mass of books previously unknown was poured out upon it?” I answer (1) were there to-day no art of Printing, a mob of rogues, say of Jansenists, could—some being in one city, others in another of the kingdom—bring out of their Libraries

and bookcases writings which they might lyingly say had been formerly written by Cardinal Baronius or St. Francis de Sales, or by other luminaries of a former age. So in days gone by did men produce elsewhere other works under great names; they were false, though now believed to be true. I answer (2) that all the books were not written at once, not poured out at the same time, nor in one place. Some in Paris, some in Italy, others were published elsewhere, and that by degrees. Very many saw not the light until a hundred or two hundred years from their rise; such as "Facundus," who came out a little before our time, and some others in our time. Others were said to be recently brought from the East, as all the Greeks, others from Italy; and this was said by those who alone had the keys of knowledge, that is, who alone had Libraries. Why should the world wonder that books came out of those houses in which most of them were openly believed to have been written? For from Gregory the Great's times to the thirteenth century, either there is no writer, or he is a rarity, whom the Benedictines do not boast to have been of their house and family.

Let no one however suppose that I am the bitter *Section 18* enemy of the Benedictines of the present day. I would not have them considered to be children of the impious, any more than children of the undisciplined, into whose place they came, on the induction of the Reformation. Dom Mabillon himself imputes to the monks of St. Remy at Rheims a spurious epistle of Benedict to the bishop Remy; see his Benedictine History, age I. in preface, sec. 2.

Section 19 The workshops and mints of this furtive coin appear to have been Corbey, St. Vincent of Paris, or more truly the monastery of St. Germain, St. Denis, Fleury, Luxeuil; in Italy Bobbio, Monte Cassino, etc. On the monastery of Bobbio see *Italia Sacra* (tome iv., on the *Bishop of Bobbio*). Against the monks of Cassino, see the animadversions of Baronius on the occasion of the Body of St. Benedict.

Wherever the monks were, the architects of these frauds (and doubtless many others, secular priests, joined with them); they are those called "Acoemetes" in their alleged ancient writings. It was pretended that they were so called because of their continuous singing, even at night!—from the Greek word signifying *sleepless*! But it certainly was not because of psalmody—which pious explanation of the word was later thought of as one becoming the monks; rather, it was because of their restless love of toil. Yet some ascribe this title to the Luxeuil monks because of the former meaning; some with Mabillon in his preface to age iv., part 2 of the Benedictine Annals give it to the monks of St. Denis, on the authority of their "Fredegarius," cap. 79. But in point of fact for no other cause, I may say in passing, was that word taken from the Greek by the impious faction, like a vast number of others, than to invite the opinion of their antiquity. For we believe usages unknown to our time to be old.

Section 20 The name of Victorinus, under which are extant Commentaries on the Apocalypse, the names also of Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, and that of Augustine

himself cast suspicion upon the monastery of St. Victor, with the rest of the impious band.

Books there were none or very rare outside the Libraries of the Monasteries down to the twelfth century, says Mabillon in his work on *Monastic Studies*, bk. i., c. xvi., p. 136. He might have said with greater truth, that in those very monastic libraries there were none or very few before the fourteenth century.

Pliny praises many Writers the loss of whose writings we deplore. They were neglected by antiquity; and of the Latins, Plautus, Pliny, nine Eclogues of Virgil with the Georgics, the Satires and Epistles of Horace only were preserved; and of the Greeks, the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, and nine books of Herodotus. A great number of other excellent monuments were neglected. Can you then suppose that a vast number of other writings would have been preserved, which are justly spurned by men of learning and of taste because of the thinness of the argument, the poverty of the style, and very many other vices, had not those interested in their preservation taken care to deposit them in Libraries—not of private men, for there were none at that time—but of the Monasteries, whence nothing could be taken except with difficulty? It was the interest of the impious band to write a mass of books in support of their hypothesis. It was therefore to their interest that all of them should be most diligently kept. They found means to attain their object.

In the Council of Arles, year 1260 (p. 511 of my *Section 22* Edition) the following statement is made concerning the books of the alleged “Joachim”: “By our ances-

tors down to this time they remained intact" (to Wyclif's time, that is) "*seeing that they lay hid among certain Religious in holes and corners, undiscussed by Doctors; if the doctors had ruminated them, they would have by no means been placed among the sacred books, and the Books of the Saints.*"

Now I say that this statement holds good of *all* the books, which are in circulation inscribed with the name of the "Fathers."

Section 23 "Jonas of Orleans" charges in the Preface to his "Cult of Images" a fraud upon "Claudius of Turin;" he is reported to have piled up bookish monuments on the African heresy, and with a view to attack the simplicity and purity of the Catholic and Apostolic faith, to have secretly and craftily left them in the *Book Case* of his Bishop. The writers of the wicked conspiracy habitually practised this trick; they cunningly left their writings in Book-Cases, that they might infect posterity. It is a lying writer of the fourteenth or fifteenth century who pretends that his own production was a ninth century work.

Section 24 How was it that no member of that wicked conspiracy repented, none revealed the secret? Because he that denies God hardly ever repents. How many Jansenists of to-day, who prefer learning, how many return to a good and right mind?

CHAPTER XVI.

The Libraries of the Monasteries formed in the fourteenth century were repositories of atheism and heresy before the time of Printing. The Greek MSS. were probably mostly written in France. "Athanasius" is a Benedictine author. The devices of the Forgers in their attempts to give their writings an ancient appearance. Hebrew MSS. are not very old : of the fourteenth century. The recency of the Royal Library in Paris : illustrations of the paucity of books there. The paucity of books in Constantinople contrasted with the number in the West after 1453. Forged alphabets and fraudulent inks.

ALL the Libraries of the Monasteries (and there *Section 1*
were none others before about the year 1370)
were nothing else, before the invention of Printing,
but so many armouries of atheism and heresies, which
for now three hundred years have been miserably
vexing and rending the Church.

When these books began to be brought forth to the *Section 2*
light, about the middle of the fourteenth century, they
were greedily taken up, and without any examina-
tion; and the impious band caused many copies to be
made of the more celebrated, and of those which they
desired to be constantly turned over in men's hands;
and they were distributed at high prices. They
boasted they were skilled in writing, and industrious
in painting pictures, because according to the prin-
ciples of their monastic institute, labour of the hands
was their delight. Yet of many works one solitary

copy (or two) is extant in the whole world, so far as we know; of works that is, which seemed less necessary or more difficult to write.

Section 3 All MS. Codices were in that age equally unknown as those are now which have not been yet extracted from the presses. They were not forthwith published when they were written, as are those which are now put forth in type; but they were stored up, to be extracted after five, ten, or more years.

Section 4 It was necessary that the books should be written on parchment and not on paper (although possibly paper was then in use); so that they might keep up the lie of great antiquity, and be longer preserved; for all books on paper either have faded writing or torn leaves.

Section 5 Numberless Codices still lie hid in the Libraries of perhaps four hundred years old (there are none, except a few sacred Codices, older); they have not yet seen the light. Tell me, because they have been in the shade for four hundred years, have they any authority from the fact that through so many years none has convicted them of falsehood? It would be a folly to say so!

Section 6 Many monuments there are to-day kept shut up in the Castle of St. Angelo, Rome, which are said to contain many things contrary to the rights and laws of the Popes. The enemies of the Apostolic See boast, in their ignorance, that they are genuine, simply because they are kept shut up there. Just as if everything that at Paris in the Royal Treasury of Charts, or in the Chamber of Computes is kept shut up, must be genuine! Why, how many instruments have I

myself detected to be false! On the MSS. of the Vatican Library see the thoughtful judgment of Baronius against the year DCIV.

In France are the greater part of the Latin Codices; *Section 7* there are few in Italy. On the other hand, there are many Greek codices in Italy, but of more recent handwriting, that is under the care of Theodore Lascaris and the Medici princes. At Corbey in Picardy many of the Latin books were written. The Italians say that France is the repertory of the Latin MSS. Hence I suspect that very many Greek books were first written in Latin, in France, because the same impiety is in both; that they were then sent into Italy to be rendered into Greek, whether at Venice or Milan or Rome, or in the kingdom of Naples. Hence, later, a few returned into Constantinople, and into France many more; as a few of the Latin, written in France, were transmitted to Italy.

A remarkable evidence that the Greek Codices were *Section 8* written in the Latin world, and perhaps in the city of Paris itself, is the Codex Damasceni, which is believed to be very old, in the custody of the Dominican Fathers of St. Honoré; for in one parchment quaternian, the Greek of Damascenus is on one side, and on the surface of the membrane Latin names with the acrostic of four parts, which savours of the fourteenth or fifteenth century:

Nitimur in vanum, dant auri pondera nomen.

The same most ancient MS. codices have the works *Section 9* of the "Fathers," both those now held to be genuine, and those which scholars are forced to confess spurious, because of disparity of style, and other

causes. This is certainly acknowledged of the codices of Athanasius by the Benedictines, pp. 49, 72, 80, 238, 667, of tome II. The same editors have rejected some of the dubious works, on which none had before pronounced an opinion. And this without any blame or offence to scholars.

Section 10 "Lupus of Ferrara," in his fifth epistle (p. 23 of Baluz' edition), says, "The writer Regius Bertcandus is said to have the measure written down of the ancient letters only, which are the largest, and are thought by some to be called Uncials." This passage indicates that the forgers had the measure and form of letters for each age; that they had not only parchments and inks, but the form of letters for all their alleged literary ages, which they might imitate in writing; so that a codex might simulate or be believed to simulate the age of the seventh, eighth, ninth, or other century.

Section 11 An example of this simulation and fraud is adduced by Dom Montfaucon himself, in his *Palæography*, p. 326, from the Royal Codex, 1684, on parchment, which contains the Gospels for the year elegantly written; the year 1336 is noted at the end. "The character of the eleventh century," he says, "has been imitated by the amanuensis" (although he wrote in the fourteenth); "but those who are used to turning over MSS. can recognise the difference at the first glance." So the dishonest amanuensis was not crafty in the practice of his art. That fourteenth century was more productive than any other of spurious codices.

Section 12 For the recent date of MS. Codices, despite the lies of amanuenses, or rather of the forgers, there is a

proof, among others, to be derived from the MS. Codex of St. Jerome, which is in the Royal Library. For the most skilled judges, on inspecting the character, would make solemn asseveration that it is scarce three hundred years old. And yet at the end the amanuensis makes the statement in Greek that it was written more than six hundred years ago. Father R. Simon, in his select Letters, tom. i., p. 218, says, "I will tell you only here in general, that very able critics have believed Greek MSS. to be twelve hundred years old, which were nevertheless quite new."

No Hebrew MSS. are believed to be more than four hundred years old; that is, in the fourteenth century were written and depraved all that we now possess; because in the Hebrew characters they could not, as in the Latin, invent different forms, like the Merovingic, the Lombardic, the Saxon, etc., of their alleged sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, etc.

We have no MSS. of the Bible in our Libraries that are not elegant, written and illuminated in the best manner; because there are none there except corrupt ones, none but those which the impious crew found it to their interest to preserve in book-cases, that they might be brought forth at the due season. Of the Vulgate Edition, on the contrary, there are no copies in the Libraries; because in point of fact, none of them were written except for use; when worn out they were thrown away, as is now the practice. Before they were worn out they were employed by the *librarii* (or bookmen) for the purpose of making other similar copies.

That Books are of recent origin is also manifest

J

from the fact that, although the French were easily inflamed with the desire of learning what had been written, yet there was no Royal Library before Charles V., called the Wise, King of the French. He, partly out of books which his father King John left to him at his death, partly out of those which he himself acquired, founded a Library of nine hundred volumes; and it was a vast number of books for those times. Afterwards it was greatly augmented by Francis I. and by Catherine of Medici, books having been brought from Florence from the Library of Lorenzo of Medici. Late in the fifteenth century, Nicholas V., a Pope very studious of antiquity, caused inquiry to be made for Greek books, which he had rendered into Latin. But in the year 1304, Simon, Bishop of Paris, has no other books to bequeath to his Church, except "books of the Chapel for the use of the Paris Church," as we read in the Martyrology of that Church, in Du Bois, p. 532.

Section 16 The books which Stephen Tampier, bishop of Paris, bequeaths to his Church in the year 1279 are these and none but these, as we read in the Necrology of the Church of Paris, in Du Bois, p. 402:—

"Item, he gave to the bishopric of Paris, and to the bishops his successors, books pertaining to the Office of the Church; namely, Two Missals, a Gospel and Epistles in two volumes, three Graduals, an Episcopal Ordinary; item, one Collectary; item, one Troperium; item, one Breviary of gross letters for the Paris use; item, one Breviary in two volumes covered with green hide; item, one small Breviary; item, two Ordinaries on the ordinary of Service. Item, he bought a postil-

late Bible in two volumes, at the price of two hundred pounds, for the needs of the Chancellor and the Paris Chancery."

No more! No Augustine there, no Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, or Gregory appears, no Master of Sentences, or other like feigned writers, disguised under great names, to the destruction of our most holy religion. Do you suppose that the Bishop of Paris would have been wanting in that age so many distinguished writers—whom the alleged "Peter Lombard," also Bishop of Paris, if we believe the tale, possessed and diligently copied more than a hundred years before—had they been in existence in the later bishops' time?

Again, on p. 531 you have a long eulogy from the same Martyrology of Bishop Simon of Paris, who is said to have died 1304. There is a list of his bequests to the Church of Paris; not a book among them!

Similarly in the year 1271, when study began to be *Section 17* taken up in earnest in Paris, the Archdeacon of Canterbury there bequeathed to the Chancellor of Paris all his books "of Theology, to be accommodated to the use of poor scholars and students at Paris in theology, and needing books." They are fourteen volumes, each containing some part of the Bible, with a Gloss. The whole instrument of that donation is extant in Claudius Hemeraeus' treatise *on the Academy of Paris*, pp. 55-57. None of the "Fathers" is here, none of the Scholastic Theologians, who are said to have written before the fourteenth century.

In the same small treatise, p. 57, we find another *Section 18* Catalogue of "books which are of the Armory of St.

Mary of Paris," taken from a small Pastorale, which was not written before the fourteenth century. There are altogether thirty-eight volumes, of like subject matter, that is, they are so many parts of the Bible, with Glosses. At the end there are added the Sentences, and the Questions of Peter of Poitiers. Altogether there were forty volumes; a vast treasure of books for those times. None of the "Fathers" is there, no Ecclesiastical History, and only one Scholastic theologian.

Section 19 After the capture of Constantinople by Mahomet II. there were about fifty MS. Codices in the Patriarchium of the city; so says Ant. Verderius, and after him Ant. Possevin. See Dom Montfaucon, p. 20. In the whole city, though so ample, scarce one hundred and eighty were found; and what has become of them is unknown. See Montfaucon again.

Section 20 In the whole of Greece this side of Byzantium, except perchance on Mount Athos—where the number of books in existence is unknown—you can hardly infer with certainty from Dom Bernard de Montfaucon's description that there were one hundred Greek MS. books. Of the rest of the East we have no information. But in the West, that is, in France, Italy, England, Germany, Holland, he says on p. 21, that the number hardly reached twenty thousand. How many more than in the East! The reason is that in the West all were first written by the forgers. More has been adduced on this head in my work *On Greek MSS.*

Section 21 The gang of forgers had Alphabets and Inks in both tongues, Greek and Latin, and parchments to suit every age. A notable example of the fraud is, that

the copies which they made believe to be about one thousand years old (at the present time) wherever they were written, show the same form of writing, the same character; simply because the writers had the same alphabet before their eyes. In the year 1712 the Epitome of Lactantius was published from a MS. of the Turin Library. The Editor gave a specimen of the letters in which the MS. was written; it is precisely the same character as that in the Royal Codex of the Epistles of St. Paul, as Dom Montfaucon has shown it against p. 27 of his *Palæography*; and in the Codex of St. Germain of Paul's Epistles, against p. 218, and in our Codex of the Four Gospels. So alike is the character everywhere, you might swear that all these Codices came, not only out of *one* workshop, but from *one* hand; or if from many, certainly from those who had the same alphabet before their eye—or form of letters which they accurately preserved in painting each. Dom Mabillon in his work on *Diplomatics*, p. 233, says, “I do not test the truth of falsehood” (of the diplomata) “only by the material, which smacks of a high antiquity; but at the same time by other characters, and above all style. The mask of the impostor shall not escape me under the show of the bark, or the seeming age of a lying hand-writing, and if the other features do not agree.” He means by *Bark* the material on which they wrote.

CHAPTER XVII.

The connection between Augustine, Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, and Jansenius as Heretics. A great number of Heresies in the monastic books are fictions: they nowhere exist. The purpose in their Invention explained.

Section 1 **T**HERE was no public Heresy, no public persecution in the Church, from the time when the Church of the Gentiles was founded and the Synagogue destroyed, until Wyclif. 'He first used the books under the name of Augustine and others forged for the purpose of attack upon the Church. Augustine first begot Wyclif, Wyclif begot Luther and Calvin, Calvin begot Jansenius, and scarce other Heresies has the Christian world beheld.

Section 2 What you read of in books as Heresies are fictions, invented for the purpose of being opposed, and so establishing Atheism. They are all inexplicable and fatuous—Manichæan, Arian, Macedonian, Eutychian, Nestorian, Pelagian, and all the rest; that is, if we understand by the name of God, of whom they discourse in these heresies, the true God whom Catholics know and worship. But, on the contrary, all these heresies are easy to understand if God is assumed to be none other than he whom impiety owns: *The Essence of all Essences, or The Formal universal Verity of all Truth.*

It is, again, clear, that these heresies were feigned *Section 3* and fabulous, from the fact that they nowhere exist in the world; none renew them, and this because they are fatuous and insane, and invented with the sole object that, by opposing them in definitions of Councils, and in special controversial writings, impiety may be suggested. The words God and Father and Son and Holy Spirit and other Religious words are understood in the sense expounded by the writers who have written these very definitions. But on the other hand the true heresies, championed by heresiarchs and their followers, will hardly ever—such is human wickedness—cease. Such are the Lutheran, the Calvinist, the Jansenist, etc.; for they fall within the intelligence of the common people.

Ought not every one to wonder at the alleged fact *Section 4* that the Heresies sprang up in the order in which divers tracts on Religion may be arranged in the schools? The first Heresies against the Trinity in general brought in eight Aeons, as Ptolemaeus; or Thirty, as Valentinus; or three hundred and sixty-five, as Basilides. Then it is pretended, that Marcion and Manes madly erred concerning God the Father; Arius on the consubstantiality of the Word; Macedonius on the Holy Spirit; Nestorius on the unity of Christ; then Eutyches on the two natures in Christ; Sergius and Pyrrhus on the two wills; the Iconomachi on the cult of images, and specially whether the image of Christ can be called the image of God; and then disputes began on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, on predestination, etc.

It is, however, the greatest interest of all the *Section 5*

heresies which now flourish, to defend to the utmost those alleged old heresies from attack as fictions; because it is the object of the impious theorists to defend the decrees in Councils *against* those heresies—the decrees defended by the “Fathers” so-called, as consenters to that impiety. But they will never succeed in disguising, from men of sound mind, the extreme fatuousness of those heresies; if by the names *God* and *Word* and *Christ*, and *Holy Spirit* and *substance* and *person*, and other names, *that* be understood as of necessity, which the faith teaches, and the Catholic faith itself understands.

Section 6 I deny that the Arian or Pelagian or any other heresy existed; but I do not say that any who may think with Pelagius and Arius, as they are described in books, are not heretics, but atheists and fools. Nay, I boldly pronounce that if there were such men, they were not only heretics, but atheists and fools. I only deny that any such men existed; and that equally they and their adversaries who invented them are to be abominated.

Section 7 A manifest example of the fraud of the invention of fabulous heresies with a view to suggest true ones, appears in Manuel Caleca, an alleged writer of the fourteenth century, in his fourth book against the Greeks. For he so attacks those who deny Purgatory as himself to actually do away with Purgatory; and of the Eucharist in like manner, and of the procession of the Holy Spirit he holds heretical and atheist opinions. And all of the same herd are of Caleca's mind.

Section 8 The impious crew saw they should be fortunate and

successful in their enterprise, if they could persuade readers and posterity that the opinion of any one writer on divine things was the opinion of the whole Church. But nothing can be more craftily suggested in favour of the dogma of the whole Church, than the published condemnation of a heresy contrary to it. Therefore they had to invent as many heresies, and as many symbols against them, as there were evil dogmas to be inculcated; and by all and each those heresies were designed to be attacked.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Lives of Saints and Martyrs clearly fabulous. The purpose in writing them. Their effect in producing true Jesuit martyrs. Church Histories and Lives of Saints a contemporaneous phenomenon with the rise of Romance in France.

Section 1 **T**O men of less acute ability, but nevertheless well trained in impiety, was given the task of writing lives of Saints and Martyrs, and Histories. And these were wrapped up in wondrous episodes, each one striving to make his own little fable fairer than any other. Hence there are in them so many and so manifest hallucinations, so many anachronisms, so many things in conflict with one another. Some things were so ingeniously written that they are not unlike histories; nay, they often pretend to more probability than the truth itself. That many fables have passed into History see the excellent passage in Baronius himself, against the year 853, no. lxi.

Section 2 Plainly, it was necessary that both Lives of Saints and Acts of Martyrs should be written equally with Ecclesiastical History; so that out of the whole class of writers and monuments it might clearly appear, that in each age of the Church the doctrine contained in the writings of the "Fathers" had been approved and handed down by holy men, and that for holding the same, numberless Martyrs had poured forth their blood.

The fictitious stories of Martyrs have had this effect: *Section 3* that true martyrs have been found in these last times in Japan, Brazil, and elsewhere in the whole world; the Almighty thus bringing good out of the very lie. For those stories inspire the minds of readers, that, like unto their God, they may devote themselves, their toils and their life, even through greatest tortures. They say that John Gerson wrote, that it was right to cleverly compose Lives of Saints, because they had much influence in the fostering of piety.

The age in which the Romance fables (as they call *Section 4* them) began to be written in France, is that in which so many Ecclesiastical Histories and Lives of Saints were forged. It should not therefore appear more wonderful that false writings on dogmas were composed, than false Lives of Saints. But it is allowed that these are numberless. Nor should it more be said, that the Church was deceived when she believed those writings of the "Fathers" to be genuine before examination, than it should be said that she was deceived because she long suffered lies to be inserted in the Breviary and public prayers, and fables of Honorius, of George, of Catherine, and others; the like of which and others, in great numbers, experts confess are there contained to this day.

CHAPTER XIX.

Renewed attack on Augustine as a teacher of Atheism. The literary Conspirators are all non Catholics: they have different conceptions under the same theological names; the "Fathers" the source of all heresies, whose common principle is Atheism: the Lutherans and Calvinists, in relying on them, lean upon a breaking reed. The Catholic Dogma set forth. Faith must be from *hearing*, not from many *books*. What the Catholic Religion and Society is.

Section 1 **I** F any one would introduce Atheism, he should do it craftily, and so that it may be by no means recognised by men of strong understanding. Can any one do this with greater subtlety and cunning than "Augustine on Free Will, book II.," does it?

Section 2 I dare none the less say, that it is easier to show that all our writers, especially on matters pertaining to Religion (I of course except the divine books) are spurious, than that any one of them is spurious. For by far more perspicuous is the consent of all of them amongst one another, much clearer and more patent is it, than the impiety of any one of them, however clear and open that may be.

Section 3 Countless are the points in alleged ancient writings opposed to the particular Catholic dogmas. Nor do they speak accurately of any dogma, unless something be added by which those writings may be forced to yield a good sense. But if it is necessary to add that

which makes for goodness in men, they certainly have it not. Therefore there is *no* good in them. But the principle is very bad, by which those very bad writings are good-naturedly explained by adding words and sentences not found in them. For what they say not, they did not will to say, nor to have it thought that they said or believed. They would not have anything else understood but what they say openly. What they did not say, they would not have it believed they thought.

He who brings forward from the writings of the *Section 4* "Fathers" testimonies to prove the existence of God, the doctrine of the Three Persons in God—the dogma that Christ is God and man, that the Body and Blood of Christ is in the Eucharist—that there is a Purgatory, etc.—acts like one who should proffer the testimonies of astronomers to persuade us that the celestial dog barks, or that the bull there bellows—astronomers who affirm that dog and bull are there. Those matters in the writings of the "Fathers" are as like *in name*, when compared with the sense of the Church, as are the words *dog* and *bull*, when used of living creatures on the earth and of the sidereal bodies.

Those who think animals to be *automata*, neverthe-*Section 5* less abuse the words received in common use; they say that dogs howl, feel, see, hear, although they contend that the meanings underlying these words can only be *catachrestically* (contrary to proper usage) made to suit those animals. So they who recognise, instead of God, Nature alone and the Light of Nature and Right Reason and Justice and formal Wisdom and Fate—do none the less make use, without any religion, of the

terms *foreknowledge*, and *hatred of evil*, and *love of truth*, and similar attributes in God, and names. So, before them *Nature* is spoken of as *artifex*, *artificer*, by Pliny (book II., sect. 66), who in like manner *knows no God beyond Nature*. In book XVIII., sect. 65, he says, "This sign God has in that month," and sect. 60, "Before God has given a sign." In book II., sect. 5, he says, "*The power of Nature, and that is what we call God.*"

Section 6 The writings of the "Fathers," so-called, are the fomenters of all heresies, past, present, and future. By the past I mean Wyclif and his school. By the present I mean Luther's, Calvin's, Jansenist. I add future and possible, because there can be no heresy which can hope for disciples unless it can prove that its opinions were received in old times. And this it cannot prove, except from those writings which comprise all possible heads of heresies. There is no heresy (if you reason rightly) which can rely alone on Sacred Scripture; since it must show that Scripture was understood by some in the sense received by itself; otherwise the heretic cannot persuade a solitary human being that he understands it as he ought. Therefore it is necessary for him to show that in some ages at least his interpretation flourished. For his audience would think it ridiculous, that a sense of Scripture was proposed by Pastors and Doctors, as if certain and necessary to believe, which, though adverse to Catholic doctrine, they could not show to have been approved by any one through the fifteen centuries before Luther and Calvin. It is on this account that the Socinians claim as on their side the Fathers of the first three

centuries; otherwise they could not find or make a warranty for their dicta. It follows that the thorough abolition of the writings falsely called of the "Fathers" is the extinction of all heresies. And henceforth the first care of those to whom the tutelage of the faith is committed, ought to be this—to diligently weigh and test them; and let no authority be attributed to them in the schools, until an examination of them shall have been instituted and completed.

Martin Steyaert, in his Latin work, "Sabbatic *Section 7* Theses," p. 45, says: "Great harm has been done to Theology by a certain enormous admiration of the ancients, and a distaste for the present writers compared with them." I say that the books of "Augustine" and others have ruined the whole of the North and the East. Why do we wait until they ruin also the West? Let them forthwith be subjected to serious examination that the impiety I demonstrate in detail may become patent to the whole world.

Whoever would not be a Catholic, must of necessity *Section 8* follow the camp of the atheists. For of all heresies now most notorious, the Lutheran, Calvinist, Socinian, Jansenist, the one common principle is Atheism. Calvin thinks of God and the Three Persons and Christ as the Atheists think, in the whole of his work *De Institutione*, especially in chap. VI., no. 19. The whole body of the pestiferous doctrine rests on that principle. It is not one or two chapters of the Catholic faith that is attacked, but the very existence of the true God; and consequently the whole of religion to its foundation. For this reason the Atheists are forced to corrupt and overthrow, not a few passages of Scripture—

but the whole of it by their perpetual Commentaries on the text.

Section 9 There is the like trickery and deceit in the triple faction—Luther's, Calvin's, and their forerunners, the "Fathers," falsely so called, in using Catholic words in a foreign sense; I mean the names *God, Father, Son, Holy Spirit, Christ, Satisfaction, Merit*, etc. The Lutherans did not dispute with the Calvinists, nor these with those of any other matter, when the Eucharist was in debate, except as to which party could craftily employ the most Catholic words, so as to maintain the error of denying that Christ is truly present in it, and that the Bread is physically transubstantiated. But there remains in the pastors—by God's blessing—there remains in the sheep—especially there remains in the Roman Church the true understanding of those words; *there* remains the tradition of the true faith. It is the part of a plain impostor, worse than a very devil, to use Catholic words in a non-Catholic sense; who speaks of *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* as three *hypostases* or three *persons*, and the like, yet by these only understands metaphysical concepts, which no atheist would reject.

Section 10 The Lutherans, Calvinists, Jansenists, and the like, are the greatest fools, to need the writings of the "Fathers" as evidence in defence of their heresies. For if it be allowed that these are impious forgeries, they lean upon a staff or reed, which will pierce their own hand. They ought to be just as convinced of their genuineness and age, as of the genuineness of the Epistles of Paul, and the Gospel of Matthew; otherwise their credulity leans upon a pro-

bable foundation only, and a fallible. Therefore they are the most thoughtless of men, who think themselves secure of their salvation, on the testimonies of "Augustine," "Ambrose," and the like; since none can be convinced infallibly or otherwise than from the vulgar opinion, that those writings are not recent fabrications of impious men. Assuredly they would not be mad, who affirm them to be fictions; assuredly they are Catholics.

Most truly did the Lord Christ pronounce, as all his *Section 11* words, so this: "*This is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*" For all heretics in this one point go astray from eternal life, because they know not God nor Christ, as the Catholic Church; but verbally only. But I superabound in joy when I understood that the faith which I profess by the gift of God is that which persisted through the thirteen first centuries, opposed by no writings, except of atheists, and that not before the fourteenth century. Who framed that faith? Who caused it to be propagated but God and Christ himself? For if any one should say, that rather is the Faith extant in these monuments, the true Faith; I ask, who afterwards founded *ours*? Who persuaded us of it? Absolutely, that could not be! Moreover, *that* assuredly is not the true faith, which is conjoined with atheism, with frauds and countless wiles, with the adulteration of Scripture and other vices.

Peruse diligently the dogmas of the heretics of our *Section 12* age, one by one; none of them, as I have said, has any note of divinity. In a society merely political and apart from God, all might be instituted and handed

K

down, which they teach, on the Eucharist, the administration of Penance, the satisfaction of Christ. On the contrary, as I said at the beginning, and am glad again to inculcate, there is no dogma of the Catholic faith which does not teach and assume as certain the existence of the true God. A mere man without God may institute a Supper in memory of the passion and resurrection of Christ. Nature cannot place under the species (or appearance) of Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ; God alone can. Therefore Christ did this. For he willed that out of each dogma of his religion it might be collected and inferred: "Therefore, there is some true God, who instituted or taught this." He foresaw that there would be men, especially in these last ill times, who would indeed preach of God, that they might avoid the stake; but by the name of God would understand nothing but "the Nature of things, the immutable laws of motion, according to which all things in the universe are ordered." For that reason, to protect the faith and the idea of true divinity, God taught that he subsisted in three persons really distinct; which can be convenient to God alone. He wrought and daily works, the miracle of Transubstantiation; which the true God alone can effect. He gives to the priesthood the power of absolving and justifying the penitent; the true God alone can give such power to men. He taught, under pain of mortal sin, the observance of the Lord's Day; the true God alone can make this precept.

Section 13 If there is some God—and there is, most surely—then He wills, certainly, that he should be known and worshipped by men. Therefore he ought to teach how

he should be worshipped and how he would be known. Therefore He ought to teach men, by whom I myself may be taught, and whom I may interrogate. And they, men taught by God—the Church properly so called. And they ought to be infallible; otherwise it would be as if God did not care that men should know how He would be worshipped by them.

The Society of these men ought ever to stand, ever to be infallible, so long as men shall have to be taught—how God should be worshipped by them. By the Church, therefore, men must be taught, what is the true knowledge of God, and what is the true discipline of morals.

That Church existed when Calvin and Luther were youths, and therefore had to be taught concerning the worship of God. But later, they withdrew from that doctrine, and led with them a very great multitude. They should return to the Pristine Infallible Society, which in their folly they deserted; or, they must of necessity err, and in their error at last perish.

Heretics, who will not hear the Church, say that from the *doctrine* should be distinguished which is the true Church. As if men could do this before they are learned, and of mature age. Youths and boys ought to be willing to be taught, and they should be rightly taught how God would be worshipped, by their elders, therefore.

You should be a Christian first, and then a learned man. Boys, I say, and youths should be faithful men. But *Faith is from hearing, not from many letters*. Therefore, if any have become Elders and Learned men, and they then from their learning or skill would

change or pervert what they learned as boys or youths, they are impious; and this because they would have another creed believed than that which they were taught by men whom God and Christ through the Apostles taught, that they might teach others the same, and these again others and yet others. This is to desire the destination of the Faith once received, without which it is impossible to please God.

Section 14 In every age God said to every adult man, who was solicitous about the finding of the true religion: "Remember the old days, consider the generations; ask of thy father, and he will tell thee." Deut. xxxii., 7. From the house and family of Noah the new society began to be questioned of the true religion by all men. It remained in the posterity of Noah, at least with those from whom Abraham derived his origin; but also in others whence came Melchisedech, Abimelech, and long afterwards Job. They who departed and worshipped idols, had to inquire whether thus the Elders—that is, Noah and others—had lived. Forthwith they might have learned from father and ancestors that they worshipped one true God, and that he ought to be worshipped by them. Nay, they knew full well that they had deserted the God of their fathers; for the sons of Noah—Shem, Ham, and Japhet—were living with their children. And these, if they were questioned, would reply either that they worshipped God, as their father Noah had done, and as they had learned from him God should be worshipped; or that they had deserted the worship they had learned from Noah; in which they were manifestly reprehensible.

So to-day is the Catholic Religion. It is a Society

known to all men, a City set upon a hill; it begins from Peter, and ends with Peter; that is, in the Apostolic See, and any Church in communion with her. That Society begins at Jerusalem, but from Peter, himself alone the Preacher, as universal Head and Pastor. Hence it perseveres in the supreme Pontiff, as Bishop of the Catholic Church (for so, as I have said, he ever subscribes); and in any Church whatever in communion with him.

This Luther, Calvin, and others, learned when they were youths; and in their old age they ought to have kept what they had learned in their youth. To any of their followers you may now rightly say: "Remember the old days, think of the generations, each one; ask thy father and he will tell thee; thy elders, and they will say to thee."

They who desert those elders are to be condemned, as they were assuredly worthy of condemnation, who deserted the worship of the true deity, as they knew it had been observed by Noah, that they might serve idols.

CHAPTER XX.

Hardouin defends his Censure of the Monastic Books by quoting from Gallonius against the Benedictine of Monte Cassino, Bellotti.

Section 1

BUT now to make an end of these general arguments: let me enter upon the Censure of writings which are commonly thought to be of the "Fathers." I have gone through, with such censure, the case of the writings of Augustine, Bernard, and Thomas, which have been happily described, also of most of the Councils; but I must deal with others while God grants me health and life. I have shown that it was right to institute a censure of this kind, unless I am mistaken; and that erudite and Catholic men think so, may be understood by the reader from the work of a scholar already praised by me, Antonius Gallonius, Presbyter of the Oratorian Congregation in Rome, in his Apology for Cardinal Baronius, against Constantine Bellotti, Benedictine monk of Monte Cassino, published at Rome from the Vatican Typography, 1604, p. 9: "You, Constantine, must be taught that *you* should be taught by what distinction the holy Roman Church is said to approve books. For not all books (as you suppose) which the Church approves, does she desire to be of the firmest authority, as are the Hagiographa, the Sacred Scripture itself, which consists of books we call canonical. To them alone

belongs the privilege that naught of what is written in them may be called into doubt, the Catholic faith being preserved; but it is otherwise with books received by the Church; even if they are *of the leading Masters of the Church*, whom for their dignity we call *Doctors of the Church*, as *Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and Gregory.*”

And on p. 10: “Learn, therefore, Constantine, to *Section 2* what kind of writings that prerogative is due; namely, to the canonical alone, so that nothing in them ought to be made matter of doubt and controversy; concerning the rest, this is by no means the case; so take heed lest you strike again into monstrous errors of that kind; but know that any one’s writings are so approved by the Roman Church, *as recognised by her*, that there must be nothing in them contrary to the Catholic faith and good manners. But if anything false should be in them, she suffers the liberty of proving this to any one that wills.”

On p. 11:—“You say a little later, ‘Since therefore *Section 3* the Church approves the writings preserved in her coffers, and thence John derived what he wrote of the blessed Gregory, it is clearer than the day that the Church approved what he wrote at least as far as the credit of history is concerned.’ But in saying this, Constantine, you almost make me blush for your sake, for you would make the whole Apostolic coffers a Hagiograph (or sacred repository) so that none of its contents can be argued erroneous, according to your contention. But how about the many *surreptitious writings* which the Apostolic See against her will has constantly to endure? It is of God alone who beholds

the heart, to be free from these; and in all things which are brought before the tribunal of the Church to know and discern falsehood from truth, but who is ignorant that men and even the Pope himself *in these matters of fact*, are fallible and may be deceived?"

So far then let what I have said suffice as *Prolegomena* to be read as a preface to my Censure, by which it will clearly appear as I hope, that the contrivers of so many Dogmatic works and of Ecclesiastical History (as they call it) had this object in view, to utterly ruin, if possible, the whole of Religion. From my treatise on the *Ancient Coins of the French Kings* it appears that this design was taken up by the impious crew and meditated in the reign of Philip Augustus; much more under Philip the Fair, and Philip of Valois; that it afterwards was immensely enlarged through more than one hundred and fifty years.

THE END.

SEP 20 1915

Webbale, Shoosmith Ltd., Printers, 117 Clarence St., Sydney.